

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE subject of *The Relations of Morality to Religion* is old but ever new. It has been recently treated by Professor W. G. DE BURGH in the annual philosophical lecture before the British Academy under the Henriette Hertz Trust (Milford; 2s. net). The lecturer begins by stating that there are two distinct questions, that of the relation of religion to moral experience, and that of its relation to moral philosophy, though the distinction is only relative; and that it is with morality and religion as experiences that he is here chiefly concerned.

The first point he would make is that morality and religion are independent forms of experience. The relation between them, however intimate it may prove to be, is not one of necessary connexion. It is possible for a man to be moral without being religious—Condorcet and Jeremy Bentham are cited as persons of high integrity who were deity-blind—and to be religious despite grave defects of moral character—and here we have regard to religious and moral practice not in the early phases of history but among the civilized peoples of to-day.

What, then, is the nature of the distinction between morality and religion? Notice that religion enjoins modes of conduct that fall outside the range of moral duty, namely, worship, prayer, and sacraments; regarded not as formal acts of observance but as the practical expression of a living faith. When brought under the rubric of obligation, these appear as duties towards God.

Thus, whereas morality is anthropocentric, and its proper field is that of human life and its relationships, religion is directed Godwards, its interest in this world and in man being motivated by the desire to realize the divine will. Love of man, for the religious consciousness, is rooted in and follows upon the love of God.

We can understand how morality is at once an avenue to religion and a stumbling-block to it. On the one hand, conscience readily reveals itself to men of fine moral sensibility, such as were Butler and Newman, as the voice of God. On the other hand, morality has frequently proved an obstacle to religion, especially at moments when the religious consciousness was, as in the case of the religious prophet, awakened to new vision. For morality, being humanistic in its outlook, and focused in social institutions which are relatively static, tends to be—in Bergson's phrase—'closed'; whereas religion is 'open,' being always more than institutions, formulas, and modes of worship, even though these be the expression of a living faith.

And what is the ground of the distinction between morality and religion? It is grounded on the two-fold character of religious experience as theoretical and theocentric; in other words, on the fact that religion gives knowledge, and that the object of the knowledge is God. But in calling religious experience theoretical, the lecturer does not mean that it is indifferent to practice, but rather that

the theoretical moment is for religion all-important. In morality knowledge is for the sake of action, in religion action is for the sake of knowledge. The essence of morality lies in *praxis*, that of religion in *theôria*.

Religious knowledge is not to be identified with theology; it lies behind theology as the pre-supposition of its intellectual constructions. Nor is it to be identified with the vision of mystic contemplation; the prophet of redemption is, no less than the contemplative, 'not disobedient unto the heavenly vision.' Indeed, it is only under the form of *theôria*, as the vision of God, that the consummation of the religious life is to be conceived. Strange that so many thinkers should have been blind to what is reiterated on almost every page of mystical and theological literature, and is, moreover, common ground to Christianity and the higher religions of the East!

Religious experience is not only theoretical, it is also theocentric, its knowledge being knowledge of God. This distinguishes religion alike from metaphysics and from morality; but this by the way. We hasten to cite Professor DE BURGH's conclusion that in the theocentric world-view moral *praxis* is enriched and ennobled by the 'infused' virtue of which the mediæval doctors spoke (moral perception being illumined by divine grace), and in the theocentric as distinguished from the secular humanism true scope is found in the vision of the City of God for the faith in human dignity and in universal human brotherhood.

In Dr. J. A. FINDLAY's new book, *A Portrait of Paul*, the first of a new series which is noticed elsewhere, there is an Introduction which is full of interest on an interesting theme. Is there such a real contrast between Jesus and Paul as is constantly and commonly asserted? Jesus was, it is suggested, the lover at once of children, flowers, and sinners; Paul looks at the sunlit world about him with gloomy eyes, sees Nature 'groaning and travailing in pain,' and seems only interested in

sinners when they are actual or possible members of the Church. Jesus told stories about fathers and sons, masters and stewards, shepherds and sheep, and the lives of the poor. Paul talks about 'the Law,' 'circumcision,' 'justification,' abstractions which mean little or nothing to us.

There is some truth in such comparisons, but they are fair neither to Jesus nor to Paul. Jesus was far more interested in religion than in the pageant of life about Him; if He took and used with matchless artistry and ease the sights and sounds of the countryside or the common ways of men and women as illustrations, they were always 'parables,' selected as suggesting something or some one *beyond themselves*. And, though Paul is the townsman as truly as Jesus is the countryman, he too has a keen and eager interest in the stir and rhythm of life about him. His very theological terms were the common places of the exchange, the law-court, and the slave market, and even words like 'circumcision' and 'the Law,' represented burning questions of social and international relationship.

A more serious charge against Paul has been to the effect that he developed the simple teaching of Jesus, concerned with the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, into a rigid and abstract theological dogma. But the teaching of Jesus is by no means simple, while Paul's theology is neither as abstract nor as complicated as some treatises on 'Paulinism' would suggest. In any case two at least of the Synoptic Gospels—sometimes extolled at Paul's expense—were written under his influence. This is certainly true of Mark's Gospel, the earliest and the simplest of the three.

It is doubtful if any of our Gospels would have been written if Paul had not created the constituency which demanded them. Certainly, if he had never done his work, the books which might have been written would not have been at all like our Gospels; we have Paul to thank for them. However independent of Paul's influence the First Gospel may be, both it and the Third accept the general Markan scheme, a scheme dictated by the

Evangelist's purpose to illustrate the doctrine of salvation through the Cross and Resurrection of Jesus as preached by Paul.

It is desirable that the shallowness of this antithesis between Jesus and Paul should be exposed, for there seems to be a serious lack of sympathy on this matter between the evangelical scholar and most of the people for whom he should be thinking and writing. Most of the scholars of this generation test the value of different strands in the Synoptic Gospels by their consonance with Paul's doctrine of salvation. On the other hand, most writers of religious best-sellers still concentrate upon the Jesus of the Gospels, with little or no reference to Pauline interpretations. These books are popular to such an extent as to show that the average Christian is far more interested in the Sermon on the Mount and the Parable of the Kingdom than in justification by faith or the meaning of being 'in Christ.'

On the other hand, it ought to be recognized that there is, in the New Testament, another type of teaching, equally primitive with Paul's and equally Christian, and that it is impossible to fit everything, even in the most authentic Gospel sources, into the scheme of Pauline theology. Jesus is the teacher of a new way of life, and the preacher of a kingdom of obedience to the will of His Father as the law of life, as well as the bringer of salvation made possible by the grace of God mediated by the faith of man.

Ultimately the two points of view—Christianity as a law of life inspired by obedience to Jesus, and Christianity as a new power to live it depending on faith in Christ crucified and risen—lead us to the same place. But we do an injustice both to the range of our religion and to the minds of those whom we would win to its allegiance, if we try to force them to enter by one gate or the other. Most of us have come to see that 'Jesus or Paul,' like 'the Jesus of history' or 'the Christ of experience,' is a misleading antithesis. It should be transcended by the idea of obedience inspired by love for the crucified and risen Lord, and sustained by His

indwelling Spirit; this binds together 'take my yoke upon you, and learn of me,' and 'to me to live is Christ.'

There are, and always have been, three leading types of believer in the Church. The first, and now the most numerous, is represented by Peter and his fellow apostles in the early days, and by the young people who have grown up in Christian homes in these. They are disciples, and have been drawn into Church membership by the idea of Jesus as the leader and master of all good living. The question which comes most naturally to them is not 'What must I do to be saved?' but 'What shall I do with my life?' The fact that Jesus chose such men to be His most intimate companions, and committed the founding of His Church to them in the first instance, proves that this type is authentically Christian. And such disciples, if they go on seeking to follow Jesus, will sooner or later come to the Cross and experience the new birth. But this may not be the beginning but the *crown* of a long period of discipleship.

A second type is represented in the Gospels by the publicans and sinners, in the Pauline Churches by most of Paul's converts from heathenism, and in the modern Church by many members of our mission churches. As the 'publicans' in those early days were instantly at home with Jesus, so their modern representatives are to-day. Jesus said little to them about their sins any more than He did to Peter, for little needed to be said. The message which wins them still is 'the wooing note,' the simple 'Come to Jesus.'

Paul represents a third class, much less frequently found in the modern Church, but commoner now than in his day. Religion had always been the chief interest of his life, but it was religion considered in its ethical rather than its mystical or theological aspect. His experience of Christ made him a mystic, his sensitiveness to the needs of his converts, his pastoral heart, made him a theologian, but his starting-point was an overwhelming sense of moral failure in himself and in the world about him. Neither in his sense of sin nor in his rapturous

exaltation in redeeming love is Paul typical of the general mood of the Church then or now. But if he does not represent the mood of the Church or the normal course of Christian experience, he does interpret for us the soul which has kept the Church alive. And so he remains the supreme interpreter of life in Christ.

The question, Why should I be good? is really an immoral question. It implies that there is something more fundamental and authoritative than goodness, a good beyond goodness for the sake of which we must be good. It has always been recognized by the great moral teachers of mankind that to seek a motive for goodness outside goodness itself is to misapprehend goodness altogether.

Still the question is liable to be asked, and when it is asked it must be patiently answered. To-day, as every one must know, the question is being asked with insistence and vehemence, often in a defiant spirit which as much as says that there is no answer.

It is to this question that the Rev. James REID, D.D., applies himself in the most recent of the Westminster books—*Why Be Good?* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. net). A more clear, comprehensive and satisfying treatment of the subject it would not be easy to find within the same limits. It faces the question fairly and gives what every reader must feel to be a very sympathetic and adequate answer.

There are obvious reasons in our time why this fundamental question should be raised. It is simply part of the great spiritual upheaval of the age. So much that was long counted stable has been overturned that it is little wonder if the young especially are bewildered and sceptical about anything that claims to be authoritative and eternally valid. And we cannot deny their right to be allowed to think through the whole question of goodness for themselves and to see the way with their own eyes. This is better far than a blind and

dull conformity, and if guided aright may lead to a more intelligent and reasoned faith.

For the question, we believe, can be answered. The moral life has its place in the constitution of a rational world. It can be 'justified by sound argument which brings mind and heart into harmony, gives peace to our whole being and enables us to walk the difficult road of goodness in the freedom of an unified personality.' There are eternal foundations of goodness which lift it above the fluctuating currents of thought and fashion by which human affairs are swayed.

The present-day rebel against conventional morality asks, Why should I not do as I like? There is much that can be said in reply. The rebel is all out for freedom, for deliverance from every irksome yoke of restraint. Well, he must be informed that this unchartered liberty is an illusion. 'The man who is led by his instincts or passions, and who claims the right to satisfy these whenever he chooses, may imagine he is free. But he will very soon discover that he is a slave.' As the Swiss thinker Amiel remarked, 'There is no ground without a master; the waste lands belong to the Evil One.'

Moreover, this liberty which is claimed proves to be in the highest degree anti-social. It would make community life impossible, for all our actions have some relation, directly or indirectly, to the lives of others. Whether we like it or not, we are 'members one of another.' 'We are units in a vast complex organisation of people. We help to create the kind of world in which others have to live. To claim absolute liberty for ourselves would mean that we restrict the liberty of others.'

There is a mistaken idea in many minds that liberty is a good thing *per se*. It has been fought for and cherished as a possession of supreme value for its own sake. But liberty is only good in reference to some end beyond itself. Its exercise is only valuable in so far as it assists the development of our true nature. We cannot, therefore, tell wherein man's true liberty consists until we have

determined what man's true nature is. Then it may be seen that many of those rules which have been laid down for the government and guidance of man's moral life are 'marking a channel, not making a chain. They define the lines along which and within which our true life would flow. And for want of understanding our true nature, the liberty to be ourselves, which we claim, may only be licence to a self-indulgence which would destroy us and bring disaster on the lives of others.'

In the blight of moral scepticism which has befallen us many views have been propounded of what man is by nature, and what kind of being he is intended to become. Some of these are too degrading for any but the basest minds to cherish, but there is a widespread idea that man is essentially, if but yet imperfectly, good. The practical counsel resulting from this is that man has but to follow his instincts and he cannot go wrong. The cry is all for self-expression, without due consideration of what the self is which is to be expressed. But 'the modern demand for self-expression is meaningless till we have decided what our true self is. Which of our numerous selves—the fighting self, the lustful self, the covetous self—are we to express? There are other selves as well which we all recognise as more honourable. There is the self which cares for others, the maternal or paternal self, and the self which at times is filled with the desire to be unselfish and thereby to forget itself.'

Those who try to live by their instincts alone find it very unsatisfying. And an impressive evidence of this is the widespread pessimism of our time. It means that man needs something higher than himself to ennoble his living. A life without purpose comes to be not worth living. In view of that 'the conviction of the heart that life must have a purpose surely has the right to be heard. Is there no faith of which we can be certain, which can give purpose to life and recover for us its zest and meaning? Must we and our civilisation perish of inanition and despair? Those who have flung faith overboard admit that their houses are

built on sand and will perish. It is good that that should be realised. But is there no rock on which we can build?'

Among the supreme moral teachers of the world there is a wonderful unanimity. They differ in emphasis and in the completeness of their picture, but all uphold fundamentally the same ideal and acknowledge the obligation it lays on men. 'Mercy and truth and the like were binding on all men; from this there was no escape; they knew that this was how they ought to live. This feeling of obligation always accompanies the ideal of goodness. It is not some fanciful picture that men have painted and about which they may think what they please. It is that which must be obeyed. The only definition of goodness for each of us in the long run is that it is what we feel we ought to do or to be.'

There is only one adequate explanation of this moral world and of this sense of moral obligation. It is to be found in man's personal relation to God. The authority and compelling power of the ideal comes from Him. He reveals Himself in conscience and claims the response of obedience. In Scripture also we have the record of men 'through whose consciousness God broke into the world, making them aware of Himself.' They all declared that the source of their inspiration was not in themselves. It was a word of God which came to them. It was a divine truth and goodness which invaded and possessed their minds. Bit by bit, as it was revealed to them, they tell of the holiness and righteousness of God, of His love and forgiveness. At last the full glory of God burst upon the world in Jesus Christ. His spirit was not only perfect in His sense of moral values, but it was also the perfect self-revelation of God. 'What this means for us is that in Jesus we have this twofold revelation—of life as it ought to be lived, and of God to whose claim that life is a response. . . . In Jesus we see man at his best. In Him therefore we have God's purpose and our ideal.'

We have to take account of the good and the evil that are in the world, and in the end we must make

our choice. 'The simplest way to face this problem is to look at the scene round the Cross. In that group, with Christ in the middle, we have together evil at its worst and good at its best. We have men raised to a fury of hate and cruelty, the victims of almost every vile passion, and we have Christ aflame with the finest kind of courage, and with love in its most victorious form. Which of these is the key to the universe?—for both belong to it. If the evil, the cruelty, the heartlessness, is the key, how are we to explain Christ on that basis?

It just cannot be done. But if He is the key, we can, in part at least, explain the other, for it is the failure to respond to His love.' Not only does His goodness overcome that evil and win through the conflict triumphant, but He has power to send forth His spirit of love into the world to redeem it from evil. Without Him the universe would prove in the end to be a godless, loveless, hopeless place, but He has brought life and immortality to light in His gospel. As St. John says, 'In him was life, and the life was the light of men.'

Some Outstanding New Testament Problems.

IX. Further Thoughts on the M-Hypothesis.

BY THE REVEREND FREDERICK C. GRANT, D.D.,

DEAN OF SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

THE Source M is the fourth foundation of Canon (now Provost) B. H. Streeter's well-known 'Four Document Hypothesis.' He is not its sole author or advocate; but no one has done more, in this generation, to win a fair hearing for the hypothesis of its existence, or to lend it plausibility, or to show how well it fits into the general scheme of development of the Synoptic Gospels.¹

In a way, as some philosopher of the history of Synoptic Criticism might point out, the formulation of such a hypothesis was all but predestined by the logic of research! The Two Document Theory having been accepted as a reasonable account of the interdependent relations of the Synoptists, there naturally remained the problem of their special matter, over and above the parallels (*i.e.* outside what used to be called the 'Double' and 'Triple Tradition'). This special matter in Mark appears to consist chiefly of brief editorial—and perhaps textual—additions to that Gospel, so that the present form, whether an earlier or a later, differs slightly from the one which lay before Matthew and Luke. The special matter in Luke appears to include a third source, L, and perhaps other written material—Professor Perry has once more argued convincingly, in a recent number of

this journal, for a special Passion Narrative—together with minor editorial additions, and the (oral or written) material of his Infancy Narratives. The special matter in Matthew appears to include the document, or cycle of tradition, designated by Streeter and others as M, together with the usual editorial additions and modifications, and also the later 'textual' variations, conflations, and omissions. One might thus view Source Criticism as the orderly examination, one after another, of a mathematically predetermined number of possibilities!

I. As a matter of fact, the hypothesis was first advanced (as far as I am aware) by an American, the late Professor Ernest De Witt Burton, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago (afterwards President of the University), in a small work with a long and accurate title, published in 1904, *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and their Application to the Synoptic Problem*. He had his own Four-Document Hypothesis—but it hardly coincides with Canon Streeter's, nor has his source-analysis won general recognition, nor even, many of his friends hold, received the attention it deserved. His four major Synoptic sources were these:

1. Mark, 'substantially as we now possess it.'
2. The special Matthean source (M), 'probably the

¹ *The Four Gospels*, ch. ix.

Logia of Matthew spoken of by Papias, now scattered through chs. 3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-26 of Matthew.

3. The Perea document (P), found in Lk 9⁵⁷⁻¹⁸¹⁴ 19¹⁻²⁸, and in some scattering locations in Matthew.
4. The Galilean document (G) found in Luke 3-7.

Somewhat influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by the 'tradition' of the elder reported by Papias—a tradition which had steady influence upon much of the Gospel research of the nineteenth century—Dr. Burton held that 'M is composed of sayings of Jesus without narrative introduction, so far as the use of them in Matthew indicates, many of them aphoristic and poetic in form' (p. 51). On the old definition of 'logion,' this was precisely what one would expect in a collection of Jesus' 'Logia'!

Burton's theory of sources was taken for granted in a volume by H. B. Sharman, published in 1909, and entitled *The Teaching of Jesus about the Future*. A folded sheet in the pocket of that book set forth in outline the sources as reconstructed by the new 'Chicago' School, and in it M was duly recognized.

Two years later appeared the now famous *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, in which Essay ix. was 'The Book of Sayings used by the Editor of the First Gospel,' by Archdeacon W. C. Allen. This essay began with a criticism of the Q-hypothesis, especially of the reconstruction given the document by Harnack, and proceeded to expand the thesis outlined four years earlier (1907) in the Introduction to the author's Commentary on *Matthew* in the 'International Critical' Series. Allen was strongly under the influence of the Papian 'tradition,' and his whole reconstruction, for which he gave the Greek text (pp. 242-272), appears to be based in some measure, though no doubt unconsciously, upon what he conceived this 'sort of Gospel writing' (p. 236) ought to be. What he tried to do was to go Harnack one better—

'on the principle that the sayings in Matthew, over and above those already found in Mark, when put together present us with a homogeneous, consistent, and intelligible work (no doubt only fragmentary). This source was a collection of Christ's discourses and sayings compiled to represent certain aspects of His teaching, and was marked by a very characteristic phraseology' (p. 242).

Naturally enough, Burton's M and Allen's 'Logia' overlapped to a very great extent, though there are some curious disagreements: e.g. of ch. 17 Allen retains only v.²⁰, Burton only vv.²⁴⁻²⁷ (v.²⁰

looks like a conflation of Mark and Q; vv.²⁴⁻²⁷ are peculiar to Matthew). In a footnote (Commentary, p. lvi), Allen refers to Burton's work, and adds: 'I have been much indebted to this book.' He did not, however, accept the designation 'M' for the special source he had reconstructed, but was content to call it (in phraseology reminding one of B. Weiss!) 'an Apostolic book of sayings' (*O.S.S.*, p. 283). He recognized in it much that was 'primitive and Palestinian': perhaps too much that was 'primitive'—or was thought to be—such as the exalted Messianic eschatology with which Matthew abounds. This, of course, now 'dates' Allen's work; Schweitzer and his 'thorough-going eschatology' were theological headliners in the early nineteen-hundreds. The brilliant and revolutionary Alsatian's exegesis, we recall, began (and practically ended) with the Gospel of Matthew.

The general tendency up to and including the period just before the War was either to identify 'Q' with the 'Logia' presumably referred to by Papias, and hence to reconstruct a document suiting the requirements of such a designation, or else to substitute 'Q' for what we now call 'M,' and—as in B. Weiss' famous reconstruction—make it include much of the Matthean *Sondergut* (Weiss even included the description of the Last Judgment, in Mt 25, in Q!). It should be noted that Streeter, who contributed five essays and an Appendix to *Oxford Studies*, leaned in another direction from that of the prevailing tendency: 'All attempts . . . at identifying as originally in Q, passages which do not occur in both Matthew and Luke are . . . highly speculative' (p. 205). On the other hand, even Hawkins, the statistician of the Oxford Synoptic scholars, writing on 'Probabilities as to the So-called Double Tradition' (Essay iii.), did not scruple to admit considerable Matthean special matter into Q; and at the same time rested much weight upon the tradition reported by Papias.

One may sum up, then, the work of this earlier period by saying that the recognition of the identity, extent, and peculiarities of the Matthean special material has been delayed, in the history of modern criticism, by (1) the undue weight placed upon the Papian tradition (or surmise?) of the 'oracles' put together 'in the Hebrew dialect' by the Apostle Matthew, (2) the ecclesiastical tradition of the Apostolic authority—if not quite the Apostolic authorship—of the First Gospel, and (3) the early forms of the Q hypothesis (e.g. that of Bernhard Weiss), which sought to combine and utilize these traditions in a scientific manner, and consequently attributed much of the Matthean *Sondergut* to this

particular 'apostolische Quelle.' At least this was generally true of English work: the story was not quite the same for Scottish, American, and Continental (apart from the wide circle influenced by the elder Weiss). Professor Moffatt's view, for example, set forth in his *Introduction* (1911, p. 247), was that 'the Palestinian anecdotes which belong to [Matthew's] *Sondergut* rarely rise above the level of edifying stories to that of historicity.' What was required, before a further advance was possible in the direction of identifying M, was a clearer recognition and firmer establishment of the Two Document Theory in the form given it, by a general agreement, in the work of Harnack and Streeter: namely, a shorter, compacter, more recognizable form of Q, without the addition of material peculiar to Matthew, and Mark more or less as we have it to-day.

II. As in many other fields of human endeavour, the War marked a turning-point. In Germany, *Formgeschichte* got under way under the dual leadership of Dibelius and Bultmann. Assuming the Two Source Theory as proved, it went further back and traced the development of the oral tradition up to the period of written Gospels and their sources. As for variant types of tradition, and their characteristics, this was the Form critic's stock-in-trade. The result—one result, at least—has been a much sharper differentiation between the various strands of evangelic material, not only between the M-type and the L-type, the Q and the Marcan, but even, and especially, between various types within these strands (saying, anecdote, etc.) and cutting across the literary differentiations. In other words, the documents (or cycles of tradition) were composed of earlier materials which were themselves of considerable diversity; all the documents (or cycles) contain materials of varied sorts and of either different origin or different mode of transmission.

In England, and the English-speaking countries, the change was not so decisive and was not so readily apparent. Synoptic criticism picked up and carried on more or less from the point which it had reached in 1914. Streeter's great work, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*, appeared in 1924. Its influence began from the day it appeared. For example, Professor A. H. McNeile's *Introduction* (1927) shows not only a decidedly favourable attitude toward Streeter's analysis of sources, but actually adopts his terminology: a decisive advance beyond his Commentary on St. Matthew, published twelve years earlier. In America, the late Professor Bacon's *Studies in Matthew* (1930) gave some attention to the possibility of a document M, at least in

the Sermon on the Mount (p. 130); though, generally speaking, his multiplicity of sources and his courageous individualism in labelling them,¹ which reminds one of Von Soden's work on the text, has prevented the raising up of many disciples. The same may probably be fairly said of Professor W. Bussmann—who would even divide Q into two component sub-sources, T (in Greek) and R (in Aramaic). On the other hand, the new edition (1931) of Jülicher's *Introduction* still maintains that most of Matthew's special material reached him orally, though insisting that the author exercised real fidelity in reporting it; he could hardly have created the anecdotes he relates—the same person could not be the accurate transcriber of Mark we know him to have been, and at the same time a prolific romancer! (p. 343). Luke, so Jülicher holds, made more use of written sources than did Matthew. But it is evident that the cycle of tradition Matthew used was, if not a document, the next thing to a written source—like a solution on the very verge of crystallization. Between such a fixed body of oral tradition and a written document there is little to choose: if it was not M, it was M all ready to be written down!

Mention should also be made of the adoption of the Four Document Hypothesis in other recent works, notably in B. T. D. Smith's excellent little Commentary on *Matthew* in the *Cambridge Greek Testament* (1927), in T. W. Manson's widely used *Teaching of Jesus* (1931), and in Vincent Taylor's *Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (1933). Professor Taylor was an early convert to the Four Document Hypothesis, setting out from Canon Streeter's first announcement of the theory in the *Hibbert Journal* in 1921, and strongly advocating and supporting the theory in his *Behind the Third Gospel* (1926) and other works.

Considerable attention is at present being given to the problem of the exact delimitation of the source, its general character, theology, origin, and date. Even a fragmentary survey like the present ought to include reference to the brilliant paper by Professor A. M. Perry of Bangor, Maine, 'The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount,' presented to the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at its annual meeting in New York last December. The author examined and restated in amplified form the position of Streeter (*Four Gospels*, 251-253), and concluded that 'at least in the Sermon on the Mount the First Evangelist used a written

¹ M (=Mark), N (=Nazarene targum), O (=Oral), P (=Pauline), Q (= 'double tradition'), R (=Redactor), S (the 'second source').

document, and . . . valued it so highly as to make it the foundation or framework of the discourse, into which the remaining materials are woven.' (The which reminds us of Streeter's view of Luke's use of Proto-Luke!) The foundation of the Sermon was not Q but M, which included: (1) Seven Beatitudes (5^{3, 5-10}); (2) Three contrasts between the Law and the new ethic (5^{17, 20-24, 27-30, 33-37, 48?}); (3) Three contrasts between ostentation and the new piety (6^{1-6, 16-18, 7⁶}). This original framework has been expanded with materials drawn from Q, other parts of M, and other sources. His conclusion as to M is that, 'since the Evangelist is demonstrably using a written source here, many of the other peculiar materials were likewise drawn from the same or a similar document. Thus the Sermon on the Mount furnishes real proof of at least a nucleus of the M document, and presumptive evidence for its existence in greater extent.'¹

Meanwhile, some of the younger men are entering the discussion, and will presently be heard from. Investigations are proceeding in more than one Synoptic Seminar. As an example of their results may be cited a Master's Thesis, written by R. H. Rosché, under the direction of Professor G. A. Barton of the Philadelphia Divinity School, under the title 'Matthew's Special Source' (not yet published).

Thanks to Dr. Barton, I have been permitted to examine the dissertation. Mr. Rosché's conclusion is that—

'Matthew served his Jewish interest by drawing largely from M, which was clearly a Jewish document after his own taste. From our perspective, however, we can see that the Judaism of M has a slightly different shade from that of Matthew. The same interest in the Jewish holy writings is manifest in both. For the law, Matthew drew upon M, quotations from the prophets he supplied himself. M supplied the bitter anti-Pharisaic cast of the first Gospel' (p. 84).

III. 'The time has not yet come when we can tell the story that lies behind the M Source. Both Streeter and Bussmann have given us reason to think that it was a later source, and, if it is a unity, the character of its parables and some of its sayings supports this view; but our investigation has suggested that it also contained sayings-

¹ It is to be hoped that this important paper will appear in an early number of the current volume of *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, published by the Society. I owe the quotations from it given above to the great kindness of the author in lending me a copy of the paper, as read to us at New York.

groups in which both the arrangement and the sayings are primitive. . . . In both M and L the special interests of very different communities are clearly manifest, and each in different ways contributes to our understanding of the teaching of Jesus and the history of the primitive tradition.' So writes Professor Vincent Taylor, in his recent *Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, 184 f. His words sum up not only his own view, but probably that of the majority of students at the present time who have given much attention to the problem. As to the question whether M is as assured an hypothesis as L or Q, the answer must probably be, No. These three sources doubtless rate, in order of probability at the present time, Q, L, M—perhaps partly for the reason that proportionately that amount of attention has been given them hitherto. What the M-hypothesis presents us with is not a clearly rounded, homogeneous, structurally organized source, which one may take or leave as he chooses, but rather the *possibility* that such a source lies embedded in the peculiar Matthean material; and until the structure and unity of the source is more obviously apparent the letter does service as little more than an algebraic symbol for this peculiar material. In the meantime, it provides a series of fascinating problems, as one of the liveliest areas of present-day New Testament research.

The proper method for conducting research in this problem is all but obvious: the first step is to isolate the peculiar matter of Matthew. This is the easier if one has already underlined in his Greek text (say Huck, Nestle, or Souter) the matter common to Matthew and Mark (say in black), and that common to Matthew and Luke outside Mark (say in red). Let the student then take a fresh copy of the Greek text and underline in Matthew what is found in neither Mark nor Luke—the result will be a kind of Synoptic *negative*. This will furnish his first and most important tool of research. Obviously, much of this freshly underlined material is purely editorial—as Archdeacon Allen pointed out (*Comm.*, I ff.). But it also includes the masses of peculiar material which contain the survivals of M, if that hypothesis, now to be tested, is true. And it also contains the striking quotations which the author has added, either editorially or as derived from some earlier source.

It is these quotations which ought next to engage his attention, and it would be well to list them separately, identifying, as far as possible, their textual character, *i.e.* as derived from LXX, Hebrew, or Targum, as accurate translations or

citations, paraphrases, or whatever. An example of such a list is the following :

QUOTATIONS IN ST. MATTHEW.

(Outside the Common Tradition, Mark and Q.)

Ref.	Text.	Context.
1. i. 23	(LXX)	Spl
2. ii. 6	(Heb. ?)	Spl
3. ii. 15	(Heb. cf. Aquila !)	Spl
4. ii. 18	(Heb.)	Spl
5. ii. 23	(Heb. ?)	Spl
6. iv. 15-16	(? Heb. infl. by LXX ?)	Mk
7. v. 21	LXX	Spl
8. v. 27	LXX	Spl
9. v. 31	?	Q
10. v. 33	?	Spl
11. v. 38	(LXX)	Q
12. v. 43	?	Q
13. viii. 17	(Heb.)	Mk
14. ix. 13; xii. 7	(?)	Mk
15. xii. 18-21	(Heb. ?)	Mk
16. xiii. 14-15	LXX	Mk
17. xiii. 35	(LXX ?)	Mk
18. xxi. 5	Heb.	Mk
19. xxi. 16	LXX (?)	Mk
20. xxvii. 9-10	(Heb.)	Spl

Such lists are also to be found in Hawkins, *Hor. Syn.*²; Smith, *Comm.* pp. xxi ff.; Feine, *Einkl.*, 45; Toy, *Quotations*, 1-73; Allen, *Comm.*, p. lxi; etc. In the one above I have bracketed those references to the text where the *substance* of the quotation appears to be derived from LXX or Heb., but with a certain amount of variation. It must be admitted, of course, that we are not fully certain in every case what was the precise state of the Old Testament text, either Greek or Hebrew, in the first century or early second, nor what variants may have existed then but have failed to survive in later manuscripts.

It has often been pointed out that where Matthew follows Mark, his quotations are usually—but not always!—in agreement with LXX; in other words, he did not take the trouble to correct Mark's quotations by reference to the Hebrew—supposing him a Hebraist. The same appears to be true of his inserts into the Sermon—which Streeter, McNeile, Perry, and others attribute to M. Where, on the other hand, the quotations are 'avowedly introduced by the author or editor of the Gospel' (Hawkins), the readings sometimes agree with LXX, sometimes with

Hebrew, sometimes paraphrase the one or the other, or even go their own way entirely, displaying only a general agreement with Hebrew or LXX; indeed, they occasionally appear to be based upon recollection of oral versions like those underlying the Targum, and perhaps reflect an Aramaic medium; in one instance (2¹⁵) the version of Aquila is almost precisely anticipated (with ἐξ, as in LXX, instead of Aquila's ἀπό). This last may be purely accidental; though Aquila's revision of the LXX cannot have been much later than Mt.¹ (According to Epiphanius, Aquila was in Jerusalem about A.D. 128-9 and following, as superintendent of construction of Aelia Capitolina under Hadrian; cf. Swete, *Introd. to the Old Testament in Greek*, 31 f.) Whether such paraphrastic—and sometimes periphrastic—readings reflect the work of one author, not himself thoroughly acquainted with Hebrew, but dependent upon the LXX, though revising it with the help of others; or whether they indicate, as Sir John Hawkins concluded, that 'we have before us the work of more than one author or editor' (*Hor. Syn.*,² 157), is still the question before the house.

Since in the latter half of the Gospel (and even from ch. 8 onward) the inserted quotations are added mainly to Marcan material (which is quite natural, for they are attached to *incidents*), one is tempted to think that this may indicate the way in which the Gospel of Matthew originated, namely, as a copy of Mark enriched with Old Testament passages and comments by the owner. This was only the first step, but it led to a second, the decision of the author entirely to rewrite Mark, and incorporate not only the 'marginal' quotations and comments, but also other material in use in his community—chiefly the teaching material we designate by Q and Spl (or M). Such a passage as 3³, especially the manner in which the Old Testament quotation is introduced (from Mark—or possibly eventually even from Q), almost in the style of his independent quotations, shows conclusively the 'editorial' character of at least some of them.

The fact that Matthew's quotations are introduced indiscriminately into Marcan and Q contexts, and into the author's own peculiar matter, seems to dispose of the theory of a collection of *Testimonia* out of which, or around which, grew the material identified as M. These are the author's (or compiler's) own insertions. Indeed, we can see the influence of the Old Testament, and of the Septuagint

¹ On the late date of Matthew, I may be permitted to refer to my *Growth of the Gospels* (New York, 1933), ch. vii.

version, at work even in passages where it is not quoted: e.g. in the account of Jesus' final appearance to the Eleven upon 'the' mountain, in 28^{16ff.}, where the writer might easily have added, 'This came to pass that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of old: *On the mountain will the Lord reveal himself*' (Gn 22¹⁴, LXX: ἐν τῷ ὄρει κύριος ὡφθῇ). Why he did not add the reference we can only conjecture! Perhaps he was too near the end of his manuscript, and considerations of space forbade its inclusion! Is it not possible that the definite article before ὄρος reflects the LXX quite as much as the specific command of Jesus—'a mountain' would read even better—unless B. Weiss and others are correct in identifying it as 'the' mount of the Sermon (5¹).

Following this process of elimination, the remainder of the Matthean *Sondergut* ought, *ex hypothesi*, to contain the special source, if one existed. Hence the next step is to study this remainder carefully in isolation, discounting the stylisms already observable in the author's use of Mark and Q (especially Mark, which we can check definitely, allowing of course for harmonistic textual assimilations). Here the lists drawn up by Sir John Hawkins, Archdeacon Allen, and others are particularly useful; though the student had best make his own, carefully distinguishing editorial additions to Marcan, to Q, and to other material. He should also study usages—e.g. 'Kingdom of heaven'—for traces of any difference from the rest of Matthew.

The final step is to examine this remainder for evidences of structure, unity of ideas, homogeneity of thought, and subject arrangement. Professor Perry's forthcoming article contains one or two extremely interesting new evidences of this, particularly in 7⁶. As far as the Sermon is concerned, we may take it as practically proven that this much of M was a written document and belonged to a specific source. Other groupings are apparent in 10^{5b-6}, 40-42 11²⁸⁻³⁰ 12⁵⁻⁷ 36-37—a 'Disciples' section, comparable to the one in Mark and the one in Q. There are also two groups of Parables, one in ch. 13 and one in 18²³⁻³⁵ 20¹⁻¹⁶ 21¹⁴⁻¹⁶ 28-32 22¹¹⁻¹⁴. There is an 'ecclesiastical' section in ch. 18¹⁰⁻²⁰, containing what looks like incipient Canon Law; a controversy section, in ch. 23 (the location of which, like that of the first group of Parables, is due to the example of Mark); and, as in Q, a long eschatological section toward the end—24¹⁰⁻¹² 30 25³¹⁻⁴⁶. There are also, of course, the Nativity Narrative (chs. 1-2), and added details in the Baptismal, Passion, and Resurrection Narratives (3¹⁴⁻¹⁵ 26⁵²⁻⁵⁴

27³⁻⁸ 82-86 28⁹⁻²⁰, etc.). Whether or not these latter narrative sections were part of M, or derived either from oral tradition or from some other source or sources, we cannot say at present. To describe them as 'Judaic' is not saying much, considering the Jewish cast of the whole work. Contacts with Jewish Gnosticism, and even with Magianism—as suggested by Bacon—are more significant, as is also the generally ascetic tone (1¹²⁵ 5²⁸ 19¹⁰⁻¹², etc.): though this must not be overstressed. Ch. 5²⁸, 'Whoso looketh . . . ' sounds like Gnostic asceticism; on the other hand, it sums up, briefly and pointedly and with added force, the first twelve verses of a great prophetic chapter in the Book of Job (31). Moreover, one must not overlook the ascetic strains in 'normative' Judaism of the Tannaite period: see Professor J. A. Montgomery's paper in *J.B.L.*, li. (1932) 183-213.

On the 'incipient Canon Law,' a feature which may be thought to point toward a fairly late date, one cannot be sure how much of this is due to M, and how much to the author or editor of the Gospel. The additions to the Saying on Divorce are usually referred to as editorial; but the section in ch. 18¹⁰⁻²⁰ cannot be wholly editorial. Its 'ecclesiastical' character is strongly marked. I even suspect that v. 19 was originally a promise that in the Christian Beth-Din the concurrent decision of two Apostolic judges would be supported from on high: an interpretation suggested by Syr Sin ('on any matter which') and even by the Greek, when you look at it again (πράγματος), requiring a passive for αἰρῶσονται, and certainly providing greater continuity of thought in vv. 15-20. Instances of textual modification in the direction of admonitions to prayer and the like are not unknown elsewhere in the manuscript tradition. Once the θη was dropped out of the verb αἰρ., and the omicron lengthened to omega, the addition of παρὰ . . . οὐρανός was made easy and natural, and followed in good Matthean style.² Other traces of ecclesiastical interests in-

¹ Another direction in which we may perhaps look for more light is the excavations at Dura on the Euphrates. See the illustration in G. Kittel, *Die Religionsgeschichte und das Urchristentum* (1932), 27, where Otês offers incense to five Palmyrene deities. An inscription describes him as a eunuch—obviously a religious designation, not primarily a physical description. At the least, it helps supply more of the Hellenistic background of Mt 19¹⁰⁻¹².

² Or possibly the middle voice of the verb may carry this passive meaning: as is well known, the passive and middle tended to coalesce in the Hellenistic period. On the passive meaning of certain verbs in the middle voice, see Winer-Moulton,³ p. 319;

clude even the liturgical—though Dr. Martin Rist, I think, goes too far in his paper, 'Is Mt 11²⁵⁻³⁰ a Primitive Baptismal Hymn?' in the *Journal of Religion*, xv. (1935) 63-77.

There even appears to be a 'Petrine' section in this special material, scattered through chs. 14-17. It is this section, perhaps more than any other, that points in the direction of Jerusalem and the mediating party, the tempered Judaism and open-hearted attitude toward Gentiles, the 'central churchmanship' of those who refused to follow either Paul or James but followed the *via media*. Professor Kundsinn, in his little work, *Primitive Christianity in the Light of Gospel Research* (translated in my *Form Criticism*, 1934), has a section on 'The Beginnings of the Petrine Legend,' in which he reinforces Canon Streeter's view, and shows how the heroized figure of Peter aided the Palestinian Church in making its great transition over to Hellenism and Universalism. Though the author of Matthew retains passages reflecting a narrower view—e.g. 10⁵⁻⁶.²³ (which must certainly come from either a written source, or from a rigidly fixed tradition, since he retains them)—he also gives sayings which reflect a universalistic outlook, and indeed climaxes his book upon the greatest saying of all.

It is eleven years since Streeter's book appeared. I do not think there is anything to be added to the tempered statement made on pp. 260 f., unless it be that vastly more students have taken the M-hypothesis seriously since he wrote, and that it is gaining in general recognition every year. These are his words:

'In view of the evidence submitted in this and the two preceding sections, it is, I think, clear that Matthew made use of a cycle of tradition of a distinctly Judaistic bias which, to some extent, ran parallel to the cycles preserved in Mark, in Q, and in L. If we suppose that the whole of the Parable and Discourse material peculiar to Matthew, plus the sections commented on above, came from a single source, it would be of much the same length as Q; and the proportion of this source paralleled in other sources would not

be greater than the proportion of Q that is paralleled by Mark. For the view that the whole of this material came from a single source, the amount of evidence that can be produced is small. All that we can say is that, while only a few passages are Judaistic in the party sense, the whole of it is redolent of the soil of Judaea; that it is the kind of collection we should expect to emanate from Jerusalem; and, lastly, that it is hard to account for the fact that so very little tradition of any value has survived outside the Four Gospels, unless we suppose that the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem, which we should expect to be quite exceptionally rich, is incorporated in one or other of those Gospels. That Matthew made use of a source or sources which were in some respects parallel to Q and L, I regard as proved; that this material, along with, at any rate, the bulk of his peculiar matter, was the cycle of tradition of the Church of Jerusalem, is in no sense proved; but it seems more probable than any alternative suggestion.'

It is clear that Canon Streeter did not subscribe without reservation to the Jerusalem provenance of M. In this he avoided the pitfall into which, for example, Wellhausen fell, who made practically the whole of the evangelic literature, Gospels and sources alike, emanate from that prolific centre. There must have been other possible locations; and perhaps we shall do best to recognize, with Streeter, the possibility that there may be more than one source embedded in the special matter of Matthew. If so, there were perhaps several stages through which this material passed before it came into the hands of our author, and more than one locality that made its contribution. If such a distinction is to be drawn—it certainly cannot be carried far—perhaps the most obvious line of demarcation will separate the teaching material from the narrative. It is, above all, the narrative—midrashic, controversial, *tendenziöse*, what you will—that provides the heaviest baggage, and the least valuable, in this special source, and most deserves Professor Moffatt's caustic comment already quoted.

IV. It may of course be objected, in spite of all, that the existence of M is purely hypothetical, and we shall be reminded of the old rule—old as the Stoics—that hypotheses are not to be brought forward unless absolutely required: *non praefer necessitatem multiplicandi*. By a grudging concession the existence of Q may be granted, at least as a cycle of tradition; but to advance beyond that and propose still another hypothetical document, or in fact two (L and M), is altogether too much for some of our contemporaries! But if a hypothesis of some kind is indispensable—the alternative to a

Robertson, p. 814. An even simpler explanation is to view the verb as an impersonal third plural: cf. Lk 12³⁰⁻⁴⁰. As Wellhausen remarks, this idiom was very common in Aramaic. *Eint.*² p. 18 f.; Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 58. The same idiom appears in Hebrew and Syriac. Aramaic apparently, like Hebrew, knew no passive of the verb שָׁאַל : the rare Niphal means 'ask for oneself'; cf. also שָׁאַל , where the Niphal 'be inquired of' is used only of God. This appears to be one more illustration of the Semitic origin of the Gospel tradition.

written document is a more or less fixed oral tradition—and if our hypothesis not only fits the requirements of the case ('saves the appearances,' as the Stoics said!), but itself suggests new steps in reconstructing the history of the period out of which it emerged, we are surely justified in retaining the hypothesis of M.

The procedure is not unscientific, but the very opposite; and it is one, moreover, that is called for repeatedly in historical studies. Lest Biblical Criticism be accused of 'multiplying hypotheses,' it may be well to consider in conclusion how purely hypothetical most of modern physical science is. No one ever saw an electron. It is only the most convenient symbol—or summary hypothesis—to account for the strange and involved equations which sum up our observation of the phenomena of electricity. To the eye of modern man, the starry sky is no more a mathematical system of galaxies and super-galaxies than it was to the Chaldean shepherds, or to Æschylus' watchman—

'high on the Atridan battlements, beholding
The nightly council of the stars.'

Yet no one doubts the scheme of celestial motions set forth in modern astronomy, a system built up

out of successive hypothesis, each derived from some refinement of observation, and all resting upon the basic assumption that the earth, far from being the fixed centre of a wheeling sidereal and solar universe, is itself surging through space, and spinning as it goes: so that every one of the observations of astronomers has to be checked and discounted by the motions of the earth and, now, that of the sun and solar system as well. Hypothesis is no confession of science that its research is at an end: on the contrary, modern science, which is mainly inductive, makes a *working* hypothesis the very foundation of its progress into the unknown. Hence we cannot agree to the short shrift given 'mere hypothesis' by some of our contemporaries. 'Mere hypothesis' may turn out to be the very clue we have been waiting for; in this instance, the hypothesis of M may throw more light upon the origin of the Gospel of Matthew than any hitherto advanced, not excluding patristic hypotheses. In fact, this is perhaps how the latter should rightly be described: that of the elder reported by Papias no less than those of Eusebius and Jerome; for the existence of a genuine tradition (*e.g.* the Hebrew 'Oracles' gathered by the Apostle) may be only a later guess as to the origin of Papias' elder's guess.

Literature.

A MAN IN CHRIST.

NOT a great many years ago the people of Germany were crying out that they were being robbed of their St. Paul; the bakers in Tübingen were refusing to sell bread to the arch-heretic, Heitmüller, and Adolf Schlatter was declaring that he would not consent to die (or even to retire) till he had gained the victory. These alarmist days are past; New Testament scholars can give full value to the modicum of truth contained in even the most exaggerated theories, while, at the same time, they marshal the evidence which puts these theories out of court. The Rev. J. S. Stewart, B.D. (Joint-Editor with Professor H. R. Mackintosh of Schleiermacher's 'The Christian Faith'), published two years ago 'The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ' as a handbook for Bible Classes of the Church of Scotland. His new volume, *A Man in Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), had its origin in the Cunningham Lectures in 1934. Like

its predecessor, it ought to run into many editions, both English and foreign.

The author is familiar with all the most recent work on the subject (indicated by the sub-title, 'The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion') both in this country and in Germany. From the list of authorities quoted there is hardly any distinguished absentee. This book will, therefore, provide an admirable handbook for students of the religious and cultural background of the New Testament. The treatment of the mystery-cults and of the Jewish Law is comprehensive, and admirable in its fairness. 'It must not be forgotten that fundamentally the mysteries at their best and the Christian Gospel were appealing to the same deep human instinct—"My soul thirsteth for God." Philo might call the mysteries "clap-trap and buffoonery," but there was more than that in them' (p. 72).

The author speaks of four attitudes to the Law. There were 'the sinners who ignored it, the saints

who gloried in it, and the half-hearted who compromised with it,' but over and above these were the people whose main feeling was one of profound disappointment and dissatisfaction; and to this class Paul belonged (p. 96).

Combined with the scholar's fair-mindedness is a certain detachment in respect of scholarly theorizings, the detachment of one who understands Paul's spiritual experience. Paul's worst enemy is Paulinism: the Apostle would refuse to 'exchange the herald's calling for the apologist's.' The two poles of this experience are indicated by the title of ch. iii., 'Disillusionment and Discovery.' In connexion with the first, Kierkegaard was fond of the phrase, 'sickness unto death.' It is the theme also of Ibsen's 'Brand,' with the grim demand of God for 'All or Nothing.' But Mr. Stewart, as is right, dwells at greater length on the second, Paul's 'Damascus day.' Finding here the secret of the man's greatness, the author avoids the mistake of those with whom Paul is dissolved in his environment or lost in the mists of controversy.

Because the author adopts this method of exposition two things are gained for the general reader. In the first place, the problems are presented as problems of *to-day*. On p. 84 we read, 'Religion has more pressing business on hand than raking among the cold ashes of extinguished fires. But the spirit of legalism . . . is by no means extinct. . . . Still the old error takes, in every generation, a new lease of life. Still the very elect are deceived. . . . We cannot afford to set all this part of his message aside with an airy gesture as though it were obsolete now. It carries permanent validity. It goes right to the roots of our modern problem, lays its finger on the Church's deepest need, and concerns the spiritual experience of every soul.' Secondly, for those who keep watch, like Nature's patient sleepless Eremit, for pulp-material, it is here in abundance; not in sermonic style, but in germinal thoughts.

In addition it should be said that the choice of passages for exposition and illustration is so nicely made that, with the aid of the index of Scripture references at the end, the book provides also an excellent and detailed commentary on the most important verses of the Pauline Epistles.

NONCONFORMITY AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS.

In his *Nonconformity and Social and Economic Life, 1660-1800* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), Dr. E. D. Bebb, M.A., has provided readers who

are interested in social and economic developments with a well-documented study of the part played by Nonconformity in a period of remarkable changes. Dr. Bebb does not believe that history repeats itself, but he does think that the past frequently offers parallels to the present, 'and not least in social and economic matters,' and this conviction supplies one of the motives for the writing of this valuable and important work. He first gives an interesting sketch of the changing world during the period 1660-1800, with special attention to the new social, political, and ecclesiastical problems which arose. Then follow chapters which discuss the numbers, and the wealth and influence, of Nonconformists during the period. He points out that 'established wealth and position is rarely for long at home in English Protestant Nonconformity,' but that, on the other hand, 'one of the types' of persons to whom this Nonconformity appeals tends to become wealthy by a personal endeavour and abstinence encouraged by this type of Christianity.' After describing Nonconformist Church Discipline, Dr. Bebb discusses the attitude of Nonconformity to the State, and examines the doctrine of Personal Responsibility in its bearing on wealth, work, and worship. It was a happy thought which led the author at this point to introduce a biographical element into his treatment. He discusses 'Nonconformist Leaders on Economic Questions,' and selects as his examples Richard Baxter, John Bunyan, Richard Steele, Daniel Defoe, and John Wesley. Very full treatment is given to the problem of poverty and the attitude of Quakers, Independents, Baptists, and Methodists thereto, but other questions are also carefully discussed, such as the liquor traffic, smuggling, prison-reform, and slavery. A final chapter of eleven pages, in which he states his conclusions, seems all too brief after so full and so capable an investigation, but no doubt Dr. Bebb prefers in the main to let the facts speak for themselves. One point of much interest arises in this chapter in the doubt which Dr. Bebb throws on the common opinion that Methodism saved England from revolution in the eighteenth century. 'The Methodist influence was real and important,' he says, but 'it was not so great that without it a revolution would have broken out.' This is a challenging opinion, and we think that on a point where he differs from many distinguished authorities Dr. Bebb ought to have had more to say. For the way in which he shows how Nonconformist Church organization gave an outlet for the activity of people 'who for the most part might otherwise

have remained inarticulate,' we have nothing but praise, and we welcome also the account of the Nonconformist contribution to political freedom and to education.

There can be no doubt that Dr. Bebb has written a very valuable book. He has gone back to the original authorities, and, in consequence, furnishes the reader with much useful information. No small part of the value of the book is that it gives a co-ordinated survey of the contributions of several denominations, instead of the activities of one. Dr. Bebb has done a work of great service to English Nonconformity and has made a real contribution to the study of the social and economic history of the period.

THE DAWN OF MODERN THOUGHT.

Professor A. Wolf deserves hearty congratulations on his encyclopædic work, *A History of Science, Technology, and Philosophy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Allen & Unwin; 25s. net). It is a large volume of six hundred and ninety-two pages. It is embellished with three hundred and sixteen illustrations. The index refers to over eight hundred names. Publishers, printers, and binders are all worthy of praise for the way in which they have contributed to the sumptuousness of the book. Their very excellences constitute matter of slight criticism—the volume is of that awkward size and weight which makes arm-chair reading difficult.

The book consists of twenty-six chapters, which deal with Modern Science, Scientific Instruments, Astronomy, Mathematics, Mechanics, Physics, Meteorology, Chemistry, Geology, Geography, Biological Sciences, Medicine, Technology, Psychology, the Social Sciences, and Philosophy. While Professor Wolf is responsible for the whole, he has had many of the chapters revised by acknowledged experts on their respective subjects; and the reader may have the fullest confidence that the information set before him is accurate. The work is fully documented and so is likely to prove not only of great interest to the ordinary reader, but of great utility to the student.

We heartily concur with Professor Wolf when he says that over-specialization is becoming a menace, and we wish him all success in his attempt to reorientate knowledge on a broad basis.

The only part of the work which does not please us is the section on p. 8, where Professor Wolf discusses all too briefly the relation of the birth of

the scientific age to religion. The question is a very complicated one, and cannot be dealt with in a few sentences as this section attempts. In consequence, the view which seems to be expressed is one-sided and indeed contrary to fact.

DR. EDDY'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

In a vivid volume, *A Pilgrimage of Ideas* (Allen & Unwin; ros. 6d. net), Dr. Sherwood Eddy, well known even to many on this side of the Atlantic, tells the story of the forty years (out of the past sixty-three) which he has spent in travel, both geographical, as a Christian evangelist and a social and humanitarian worker, and ideological, as a 'mis-educated' person who has been 're-educated.' In the course of his geographical travels he has visited nearly all lands, especially the strategic countries of Orient and Occident in times of crisis and change. In rapid succession he found himself a part of the student movement of North America, the missionary crusade in Asia, the World War in Europe, and the social upheaval—in Soviet Russia and the Western world—which followed the War.

As for his ideological travels, these are also here set down in graphic style, though the course of them is not so readily distinguishable as in the former case. In particular one would have welcomed a clear statement of the changes that have taken place in his Christian outlook. The point which a perusal of his autobiography brings out most clearly is that Dr. Sherwood Eddy is now committed to seek first the new social order for which socialism stands. Here is how he states his position in terms of the dialectic interpretation of history, in which progress is through conflict: 'The world to-day is divided between the three conflicting systems of capitalism, fascism, and communism. The thesis of capitalism with its rank injustice has provoked the challenging antithesis of communism. Again, as an historic fact, the thesis of communism, as embodied in the Soviet Union with its red terror, produced the antithesis of fascism as Mussolini in Italy, Hitler in Germany, and other reactionary movements sought to save themselves from a communist revolution. If communism and fascism be conceived as the two extreme terms of thesis and antithesis, then the final synthesis cannot be the injustice of capitalism, the terror of communism, nor the tyranny of fascism, but some form of socialism.' An interesting but not a clear-cut statement, viewed dialectically.

SCIENCE AND THE HUMAN TEMPERAMENT.

Professor Schrödinger is one of the greatest living physicists. In 1926 he succeeded Planck in the Chair of Theoretical Physics in the University of Berlin, but he is now domiciled in England at Oxford. Under the title of *Science and the Human Temperament* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) eight of his lectures have been translated by Dr. James Murphy and are introduced in a foreword by Lord Rutherford. The lectures deal with such topics as Science, Art, and Play; the Law of Chance; Indeterminism; and Wave Mechanics. Schrödinger regrets that Bohr's model of the atom with nucleus and revolving electrons, though most valuable in its day, has now become rather a hindrance to the development of thought. Unfortunately, it so caught the popular imagination that it will doubtless continue to linger in the text-books and in popular expositions, though the atomic physics of to-day has quite transcended it. On the question of Determinism Schrödinger takes the side of Eddington, that our knowledge does not go beyond 'statistically regulated phenomena.' 'The demand for an absolute law in the background of the statistical law—a demand which at the present day almost everybody considers imperative—*goes beyond the reach of experience*. Such a dual foundation for the orderly course of events in Nature is in itself improbable. *The burden of proof falls on those who champion absolute causality, and not on those who question it*. For a doubtful attitude in this respect is to-day by far the *more natural*.' One interesting lecture deals with the question, Is Science a Fashion of the Times? In it Schrödinger shows how science is 'liable to alter with the alteration of the cultural environment.' The style is lucid and the manner of treatment is as clear and interesting as the abstruse nature of the subject permits.

CHRIST AND COMMUNISM.

A new book by Stanley Jones is sure of a wide and cordial welcome, and this book—*Christ and Communism* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net)—sustains the high reputation of its author. It has all the familiar marks of directness, simplicity, evangelical proportion, and fervour. Peripheral things, which even the Church so easily transfers to the centre, are brushed aside with impatience and the vital issue is made to stand out in bold relief. The supreme *Either-or* of our time is held to be *Christ or Communism*.

The merits of Communism, as it is illustrated on the national scale in Russia, are frankly admitted. It is precisely these merits that make Communism so dangerous a foe. They can be summed up in the replacement of competition by co-operation. The book argues vehemently that unless Christendom frees itself speedily from the shackles imposed on it by the competitive system it will go down before Communism. Christianity must stand for the Communism of the Early Church if it is to stand at all.

Like most vital books this raises some questions to which it provides no clear answer. Even if we assume, as we cannot all do, that a communistic system of goods is the ideal for humanity, we are met by the practical question as to how a Christian Communism is to be inaugurated in the world before the world is predominantly Christian, in fact as well as in name. Stanley Jones holds that the system must be inaugurated quickly. There is no time to lose. We cannot afford to wait until a sufficient number of people are really Christian. Yet he seems to have no other means to suggest for the setting up of the desirable system than the Christianizing of individuals. The fact is that a Communism like that of Russia can be set up quickly, while a Communism like that of the Early Church must tarry until the world is somewhat like the Early Church in character.

The point at which the book will be most disappointing to lovers of the New Testament is where it asserts that a bad environment prevents a man from rising to the full height of the Christian life. 'We have gone as far in spirituality as we can under the competitive system. We are blocked at every turn in further individual and collective spiritual development' (p. 74). This is not the authentic note of the gospel. All the Beatitudes presuppose a bad environment for their background. By all means let us work for the betterment of the environment, but let us not deny the gospel by telling a man that he can go no farther in the Christian life until the system around him is changed for the better.

But this book, whatever its blemishes may be, is a prophetic call to the Church to take its faith and message seriously. As such it is to be wholeheartedly commended.

A NEW SERIES.

The Epworth Press is publishing a series of books under the general title 'God and Life' Series. They are attractively got up, very moderate in

price (3s. 6d. net) and designed to interest and instruct the 'general reader.' The subjects range over the Bible, Biography, History, Literature, Social Science, Philosophy, and Religion, a wide enough net for a good catch. The series gets a good start with *A Portrait of Paul*, by the Rev. J. Alexander Findlay, D.D. Dr. Findlay reminds us often of Dr. Glover. He is just as individual, but in his own way. The likeness is in the fresh directness and competence of his thinking, and the charm of his writing. We cannot have too many books on Paul, provided the writers see with their own eyes. We can forgive a lot to any man who appreciates the size and the charm of the Apostle. Dr. Findlay deals with his subject under five heads: Saul of Tarsus, The Missionary, The Thinker, The Pastor and Letter-writer, and The Man and the Saint.

Liberal Puritanism follows, by the Rev. A. W. Harrison, M.C., B.A., B.Sc., D.D. It contains a batch of essays on various aspects and representatives of his subject—The Cult of St. Francis, Milton's Prose Works, R.L.S., and The Philosophy of D. H. Lawrence among other matters. The two last, on Stevenson and Lawrence, are specially attractive, but the whole book is interesting and will furnish some good hours to the reader.

The Message of the Parables is by the Rev. R. E. Roberts, D.D. It is written to offer suggestions as to their bearing on present-day life, and the writer has his eye all the time on up-to-date applications. Expositions of the Parables have changed a good deal since the time of A. B. Bruce and Trench. The older writers were elaborate, solid, leisurely, and expansive. The newer ones are more snappy and immediate. In this volume we have Parables dealt with under titles like these: A1 and C3, R.S.V.P., Press the Button, Best Clothes, No Gratuities. But the expositions that follow are not really 'cheap.' These are genuine interpretations, pleasant to read, and edifying in the best sense.

The latest volume in the series is *Interpreters of Life*, by the Rev. Robert Strong, M.A., B.Litt. It contains twenty essays on life and literature, viewed from the religious standpoint. The two first essays on the interpretation of life are richly suggestive, and will, we fancy, provide the starting-point of some good sermons. The other topics have all a literary flavour, but always with the religious significance well in view. Donne, George Herbert, Blake, T. E. Brown, Alice Meynell, Ibsen (his 'Value to the Preacher'), Mark Rutherford, Hardy, T. S.

Eliot, Robert Bridges are among them. This is a good book to take away on a holiday. It is light reading, but of the best kind and always stimulating.

The American point of view on some great problems is presented in *Decisive Days in Social and Religious Progress*, by Bishop Adna Wright Leonard (Abingdon Press; \$1.50). The subjects are War, The Liquor Trade, Religious Education, Missions, and Evangelism. The essays are good, with some sound thinking and all on the side of the angels. They share the weakness of many American books of the same kind. There are too many words. But the words mean something, and perhaps the spate may bring some treasure-trove that the more slender stream might miss.

The British Christian Endeavour Union has published a book, *The Miracle of Miracles*, by the Rev. F. J. Miles, D.S.O., O.B.E. (1s. 6d. net). The form of the book is not inviting, for its pages are crowded and the type is unattractive. This is to be regretted for it is full of good things. It makes no pretensions to erudition, but gathers together a wealth of information about the inspiration, origin, and use of the Scriptures. Part I. speaks of their unity, vitality, and authority; Part II. gives some account of the history of the Canon; while Part III. contains counsels as to right methods of Bible study. The book should prove very valuable both as a stimulant to faith and as a popular book of reference.

In that excellent series 'The Cambridge Miscellany,' a lovely little book has just been included—*The Four Gospels—Printed in Paragraphs from the Text of the Authorised Version* (Cambridge University Press; 3s. 6d. net). The book is exactly what it professes to be. But one or two features may be noted. Chapter and verse divisions are abandoned, but they are indicated in the page-headings. Poetry is printed poetically. Direct speech is shown by quotation marks. Breaks in the narrative are made clear by white spaces. Above all, the print is dark and clear, and the binding beautiful. This is a book you can slip into your pocket; and is a pleasure to hold in the hand.

The Matriculation Address at Drew University was given, in September 1934, by the Rev. Dean Lynn Harold Hough, Th.D., D.D. The subject chosen was *The Queen of the Sciences in 1934*

(Drew University Bulletin, xxii.), and the distinguished writer gives us a survey of the history of thought throughout the ages. He brings out clearly what many of us learned from Schwegler's 'History of Philosophy' long, long ago, that there has been a constant swing of the pendulum between naturalism and a spiritual interpretation of the universe. We have come back in our day to the latter, and, as Dr. Hough says, 'the year 1934 is a good year for the student of theology.' Altogether an illuminating and encouraging essay.

A beautiful book of devotion, most attractive in form and substance, has been edited by Mr. Wilfrid Harper—*A Guide for Private Prayer* (Epworth Press; cloth 2s. 6d., leather 3s. 6d. net). It contains guidance for morning, noon-tide, and evening worship. Forms and suggestions are given for every period of the day, on awakening, in the morning, afternoon and evening, and before sleep. As it is presented here, the scheme could only be carried out by some one with a great deal of leisure. It would be impossible for the average busy man or woman. But that does not make the book superfluous for such people. The briefer acts of devotion suggested would not occupy many seconds. And those who need some help in their prayer-life (and who does not?) will find a great deal in this little book that will help to make their prayer-time real and uplifting.

The Rev. Canon Lukyn Williams, D.D., whose interest in Jewish literature and in the Jewish people is well known, has written 'a book for honest thinkers, whether Jews or Christians.' It is entitled *The Foundation of the Christian Faith* (Heffer; 3s. 6d. net), and is a piece of persuasive apologetic. It is written with great clearness and sympathy, and while designed primarily for Jewish readers it will be found most informative and helpful by any inquiring mind. Its three main sections deal with the revelation in the Old Testament, Jesus of Nazareth, and Difficulties and Questions. Among the appendices there is an interesting note on the original form of the name Jehovah. Canon Williams decisively rejects Yahweh as being 'little more than a mistaken deduction made by Ewald in the middle of the nineteenth century from Exod. 3. 14 seq.; 6. 2 seq. It explains none of the Hebrew proper names. Least of all could its two quite short vowels be used in the loud call upon the Deity in the customary worship of Israel.' He himself has no doubt that the name was originally pronounced Jāhōh, and he

argues in favour of that form. His book is one that should be widely read.

There must be an immense public for books on the Master, for they appear in a continuous stream. But there was room for the Rev. Canon Anthony Deane's book—*Jesus Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net), as there is always room for any book on this subject by a man who looks at Jesus with his own eyes. It is not a 'life' of Jesus. Very much is omitted. But the writer has seized on the salient points, and tried to present to the reader the facts on which a judgment about Jesus Christ must be made. You will find something of the background of the life here, but mainly you will be helped to 'see Jesus.' And on many pages you will find fresh light on familiar situations, because the writer has read and pondered for himself. We wish this book many readers.

Readers will remember Dr. Ebenezer Macmillan's first volume of Group sermons, 'Seeking and Finding.' He has now written a sequel which he calls *Finding and Following* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). Here he deals not with life changing, but with the further question, is 'the change in my life being followed out and applied in all the relationships and problems for which I am more or less responsible?' The motive of the book is expressed in Walt Whitman's 'Pioneers.'

All the past we leave behind:
We take up the task eternal, and the burden, and
the lesson,
Conquering, holding, daring, venturing, so we go
the unknown ways,
Pioneers! O pioneers!

The inspiring message of the sermons will be appreciated from the example we have quoted—Eighth Sunday after Trinity, in 'The Christian Year.'

A further contribution to the *Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures* (volume i. part 3) has been made by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph Dean, D.D., Ph.D., in 'The Gospel according to St. Luke' (Longmans; paper covers 4s. net, paper boards 5s. net). Mgr. Dean, who is President, and was sometime Professor of Sacred Scripture, at St. Joseph's College, Upholland, writes with an able pen and with a competent knowledge of the work of other commentators. The translation is good and often suggestive, but the notes are rather brief and are strongest on the linguistic side. The difficulties under which Roman Catholic expositors

are compelled to work are rather painfully evident in this commentary. For example, in treating Lk 22¹⁹, Mgr. Dean finds it necessary to insert explanatory references to the decisions of the Council of Trent, and in dealing with the textual difficulties of Lk 22^{43f.} he says that 'Catholics may not question the inspiration and canonicity of these verses.' As regards the 'Western Non-interpolations' as a whole he writes: 'It may be difficult to account for the origin of these early omissions and additions in D and the Old Latin, but they must obviously yield to the far greater weight of contrary witnesses.' Father Lattey is said to be directly responsible for the Introduction, which discusses, somewhat perfunctorily, the questions of Authorship, the Historical Character of the Gospel, the Author, and the Text. The Commentary is well printed on excellent paper, and the Editors are to be congratulated on their attempt to provide the members of their own Communion with a serviceable translation and interpretation of the Scriptures at so reasonable a price.

My Private Prayer Book (Lutterworth Press; 6d. net), by the Rev. R. Wood-Samuel, will help those who find difficulty in expressing themselves in prayer, even in private. The author says he has found many such people, and he has done his best in this little manual to 'open their lips.' The prayers are simple and devout, and include Holy Communion, Morning and Evening, and Home Life.

Miss B. K. Rattey, S.Th., conferred a real boon on many non-expert readers by her 'Short History of the Hebrews.' That was a 'find.' And now she has set her hand to a New Testament study in *The Growth and Structure of the Gospels* (Milford; 2s. 6d. net). It is a small book, but the writer has packed an immense amount of information into it. She has obviously mastered the relevant literature on the subject, and certainly does not lag behind the foremost in her conclusions. The book has seven chapters—The Preparation for the Gospels, The Forerunners of the Gospels, The Gospel according to Mark, Luke, Matthew, John, and the Canon of the New Testament. It must be confessed that this book is not quite so successful as the Old Testament one. There the stream flowed on smoothly, and there was little difficulty in picturing it. In this book the analysis is much harder to present, and probably even the students for whom it is designed may find it a little formidable. In addition to this Miss Rattey leans rather heavily on some of her authorities, even when they are not certain of holding her up.

But when this has been said, the merits of this able and scholarly work must be recognized. If the reader will apply his intelligence to these studies, he will be able to distinguish between the suggestions of critics and their assured results, and he will be amply rewarded by an enlightening survey of the whole field.

Every one must agree that 'study of The Mahābhārata is indispensable for those who would learn to understand the spirit and culture of ancient India.' And yet it is so huge, so multifarious in its contents, and its authorship, such an astonishing amalgam of all kinds of things from all kinds of minds, that it is difficult not to lose one's way in this extraordinary jungle, and really to know it seems almost impossible. As Mr. Rice puts it, 'it is much more than an epic story of the heroic age of ancient India. It is a vast repository of Hindu traditional lore, philosophy, and legend. It has been the quarry from which dramatists have drawn much of their material for fifteen centuries. It is accepted as an authoritative Smṛiti by a hundred million followers of Brahmanical tradition. It is not the work of one author, nor representative of any one time, but the production of many generations of Brahman writers through nearly a millennium. In it have been incorporated extensive treatises on law, philosophy, religion, and custom, together with numerous episodes, legends, and discussions—amounting in all to four-fifths of its bulk, which is eight times as great as that of the Iliad and Odyssey put together, and three and a half times that of the entire Bible. It discloses to us an age-long quest, made by a religiously minded people, to a solution of the perennial problems of the human race with regard to the relation of man to the seen and the unseen universe, death and the hereafter, sin and sorrow, the standards of conduct and the way to eternal life.'

Obviously a map is needed for this jungle. And Mr. Rice gives it us in his admirable *The Mahābhārata: Analysis and Index* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net). None of the glory of the great epic is here, for the book is simply what it says—an index, curtly setting down a bare analysis of the chapters in the fewest possible words. But it should make the going easier for many feet, and give sense of direction to those who had felt lost, and let the sky break in.

Among the numerous books about Sunday-school work which have been constantly pouring from the press for many years there has been,

strangely enough, not one dealing with the work of the Superintendent. This lack has now been rectified by the indefatigable Mr. Ernest H. Hayes, whose books on religious teaching must have reached a large total, in *The Superintendent's Handbook* (National Sunday School Union; 1s. net). It is called a 'practical Sunday School manual,' and, as a matter of fact, it deals with every aspect of the Sunday School organization and curriculum. If only superintendents would read this book and humbly follow its counsels we should see a great improvement in our schools. For the leader in a Sunday School is the key to everything said and done in it. And those who are interested in such work know that no one could be found more capable of giving needed guidance than Mr. Hayes.

More Stories for Beginners, by Miss Winifred E. Barnard (National Sunday School Union; 1s. net), will be found as good as its predecessor. These stories are all about simple things—winter, harvest, holidays, children of other countries, homes and games. They are told with the skill of a trained teacher and the sympathy of a lover of children.

Dr. Morgan Campbell has issued a second edition of his little book on *The Practice of Prayer* (Oliphants; 2s. 6d. net). As one would expect from the title and from the well-known attitude of the writer he does not deal with the intellectual difficulties that haunt the modern mind in regard to the efficacy of prayer, though he is not unaware of these. His conviction is that the only method is to resolve these difficulties by the practice of prayer, and for this he gives many wise counsels and helpful hints. His book is dedicated to the memory of Marianne Adlard, the invalid lady whose intercessions for Moody were acknowledged by him as the beginning of his great work of revival in Britain. This lady was a member of Dr. Campbell Morgan's church at New Court, and he warmly acknowledges his indebtedness to her.

God's Christ and God's Book, by Mr. Archie Naismith, M.A., and Mr. W. Fraser Naismith (Pickering & Inglis; 1s. 6d. net), is the work of two brothers who are united in their devotion to Christ and the written Word. The book is designed to support the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures and the doctrines of the faith as contained therein. Its authors have gathered their material from many fields, but their main argument is derived from the Bible itself in which they are manifestly well versed.

Perhaps their earnestness makes them somewhat narrow and unsympathetic towards views from which they differ, but of their passionate Christian devotion there can be no doubt.

There has been a growing feeling in educational circles that the conventional pictorial representations of Jesus do not correspond to the true gospel facts, and one experienced teacher was so troubled by this that she appealed to several eminent persons to do something about it. The result was a letter to 'The Times,' and thereafter a conference at which the leading publishers of religious pictures were represented. This was followed by an exhibition of pictures at which distinguished religious leaders gave addresses. These addresses have now been published in a little brochure under the title *Pictures of Jesus for Children* (R.T.S.; 1s. net). Most of the addresses are by eminent teachers (like Mr. Jacks of Mill Hill School, and Mrs. Hetty Lee Holland), and their views will afford guidance in the choice of pictures for those who are engaged in the training of the young. The idea of the book is excellent, and the practical nature of the advice it affords will be found to be invaluable.

In this connexion mention may be made of a series of pictures in packets, each containing twelve pictures, dealing with Bible events. It is called 'The Crown' Series (R.T.S.; each packet 1s. net). Already fourteen packets have been issued, the first twelve apparently by Mr. Harold Copping. The last two have reached us and are respectively on *The Story of Joseph* and *The Prodigal Son*. They are both good, but the twelve depicting the life of Joseph are much superior. In colour, drawing, and background they are excellent. These collections may be cordially commended for school work.

In *The Story of Christendom* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net) Miss Caroline M. Duncan-Jones has written a book full of interest and instruction, the fruit of immense labour, and yet with not an atom of dullness. It is divided into three parts—the 'Making of Christendom' (up to the breach between Rome and the East), 'Reformers in Christendom' (up to the counter-Reformation), and the 'Expansion of Christendom' (to the present day). Of course the events narrated bristle with all kinds of challenge to the partisan, but Miss Duncan-Jones has managed to sail on a fairly even keel. Many readers will protest against the statements in chapter two that 'presbyter' is the same as 'priest,' that James was Bishop of Jerusalem, that

'new priests were ordained by the presbyters.' Scotsmen will resent the very slight mention of Scottish Presbyterianism. But these are minor criticisms. The book as a whole is excellent, and presents the whole story of the fortunes of the Christian cause vividly and worthily.

There are many series of lessons for Sunday Schools, but not many books of this kind have been written for the benefit of adolescents. This is the motive of *Forty-Five Talks for Bible Classes* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). The book has been written by Mr. P. C. Sands, Headmaster of Pocklington School, and is therefore by an expert. The lessons are fresh and suggestive, cover a wide range, and are obviously meant to stimulate inquiry in the minds of those who listen to them, or at least to the substance of them, for they are meant to provide material for the teacher, not to save him work. The talks are arranged in short series which include the days of the Christian Year, Prayer, Great Men, Great Mottoes, and Great Matters. There are numerous literary illustrations, and topics of immediate social and religious importance find a place in the talks. The book is calculated to be of very real assistance to religious teachers.

In *Samaria, Ephesus, Lambeth* (S.P.C.K.; 6d. net) Mr. A. T. Fryer, A.K.C., sets out to show that in the Lambeth Resolutions on the Rite of Confirmation the Bishops exceeded their powers and took on themselves an authority which belongs of right only to a General Council.

The Fate of Man in the Modern World (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net) is a translation of a book by the Russian writer Nicholas Berdyaev. It draws a very gloomy picture of the present state of the world and of the demonic forces that threaten to engulf civiliza-

tion. It emphasizes especially the danger that personality may be crushed out under the weight of mass movements, and that freedom of conscience may be lost under absolute dictatorship. The writer is convinced that nothing can avert these calamities but a spiritual revival. 'Only a mobilization of the spirit can be set up against modern collective insanity and demonic possession, against modern polydemonism and idolatry. Social organization alone is powerless to struggle against this chaotic decay of the world and of man. . . . Once again man must return to monotheism, or else degenerate, be resolved into cosmic elements compulsorily organized into social collectives.' At the same time the writer holds the somewhat curious opinion that 'the true and final renaissance will probably begin in the world only after the elementary, everyday problems of human existence are solved for all peoples and nations, after bitter human need and the economic slavery of man have been finally conquered. Only then may we expect a new and more powerful revelation of the Holy Spirit in the world.' History would hardly support the view that man, when he is full fed, is most receptive of the Spirit of God.

An admirable handbook for study circles and youth groups, dealing with the problems of our time, will be found in *Christianity and Modern Life* (Youth Committee of the St. Alban's Diocesan Board of Religious Education; 1s. net). There are outline studies on the Existence and Nature of God, The Christian Background, The Christian and Home, The Christian and Citizenship, Money, War, and Industrial Questions. They are all useful, because they are intelligent and practical. A great deal of honest thinking and experience has gone into the preparation of this little book.

Worship.

BY THE REVEREND T. C. BOWEN, THE VICARAGE, MOUNTAIN ASH.

It is a curious fact that although one of the most characteristic activities of Christians has always been the assembling of themselves together for worship, yet it is a subject that has on the whole received but scant consideration on the part of clergy and ministers generally. Our printing presses

annually pour out books on all kinds of theological subjects, but the number dealing with worship forms is but a negligible proportion of the whole. It is with the aim of directing attention to this vital activity of the Christian community that this article is concerned.

Before dealing with the subject of worship in detail, it is helpful to obtain a synoptic view of the whole first by comparing Christian worship with other forms, and making certain broad distinctions between them.

In the first place, there is the broad distinction between the worship of the Old Testament and that of the New. In the Old Testament we are confronted with a highly developed sacrificial system where animals and birds are slain and offered on the Temple altars at Jerusalem. In the New Testament, although the language of sacrifice still lingers on, the sacrificial system as such has been abolished. Christians still speak of sacrifice, but they refer to something in the past—Christ's sacrifice on the Cross—and sing of 'Christ our Passover who has been sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast.' They contrast spiritual sacrifices, *i.e.* the willing offering of themselves, their souls and bodies, with the formal sacrifice of unwilling animals.

Another broad distinction is that between the worship of the East and that of the West. In the East, on the whole, worshippers approach their gods or idols individually. On their great feast-days they flock to the temples, but there is no such thing as organized worship. The individual enters the temple, bows before his god, says his prayer, makes his offering, and then goes on his way to join the crowds outside. On the other hand, in the West, on the whole, worship is a corporate affair in which all the worshippers join together. Curiously enough, this corporate aspect is revealed in its most pronounced form in Muhammadanism (whose home is midway between East and West), where the worshippers are drawn up in ranks, and prostrate themselves and repeat their prayers together in a way which strikes the onlooker as being prayer-drill rather than worship.

Nevertheless, nearly all forms of worship have certain features in common; for instance, the making of an offering is almost universally either a part of the rite or is made separately by the worshipper. And, secondly, worship is generally accompanied by some kind of posture or gesture, such as kneeling, prostration, the spreading out of the hands (a posture commonly met with in the Catacombs; cf. Is 1¹⁵), or movements such as processions. The sole exception appears to be the 'silent worship' of the Quakers. In the Bible the words 'worship' and 'bow down' are interchangeable; for example, Mt 4⁹ R.V., 'All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.' Literally, 'go down on thy knees to

me' (*προσκυνήσης*). Or the delightful passage, 2 K 5¹⁸, 'In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant; when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon; when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing,' where it is clear that 'bow' and 'worship' are synonymous (LXX, *προσκυνέω*).

Worship, then, may tentatively be described as some form of corporate homage paid to God, generally accompanied with appropriate gestures and an offering.

Within the Church itself there are now, always have been, and in all probability always will be, great varieties in the *form* of worship. The Early Church was not provided with a Prayer Book or Directory ready-made—it had not even a Bible for that matter, except the Old Testament—and so the order of service depended very largely on the discretion of the officiating minister, who made up the prayers extemporaneously as he went along. From the fragments of such recorded prayers as we have, and from our own conjectures as to the form they would take, we may assume that these were largely moulded on the synagogue pattern. 'The Christian Liturgy to a great extent took its rise from the Jewish Liturgy, and was, in fact, merely its continuation. But here it is important that we should not confound the worship of the temple at Jerusalem with that of the synagogue.' ¹ 'These four elements [of synagogue worship] lections, chants [*i.e.* the Psalms], homilies, and prayers—were adopted without hesitation by the Christian Churches.' ² In addition to these, there were, of course, the two dramatic rites of baptism and the agape-eucharist, which from the beginning had certain fixed elements or formulæ. When the Church spread beyond the confines of Judaism, and other nations with a different cultural and religious background were gathered in, naturally such words and forms as they had been used to were progressively incorporated into the worship and adapted to meet new occasions and situations, much as the Creed was enlarged to counter any deviations from the original tradition.

But there is one powerful factor in influencing the form of worship to which comparatively little attention has been directed. National or temperamental affinities seem to cause nations or individuals to fasten on certain aspects of God's nature, and these conceptions invariably reveal themselves in

¹ Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 5th ed., p. 46.

² *Ib.* 48.

the form of worship. On the one hand, an examination of Greek forms of worship suggests the idea that the ceremonies and phraseology of the Byzantine court were transplanted to the Church and adapted for Christian worship; while, on the other hand, the restrained decoration and marked simplicity of the Calvinist form point eloquently to the underlying belief in the greatness and glory of God which fill the sanctuary, and which thus render man's efforts largely superfluous. While yet again the minute directions and sober tone of the prayers in the Latin rite irresistibly remind us of the Roman genius for practical organization.

Faced with this welter of diverse forms and modes of worship, it is apposite to re-examine the charter of Christian worship as given in our Lord's conversation with the woman of Samaria (Jn 4⁷⁻²⁶). The woman tries to evade the personal trend of the conversation by referring to the long-standing controversy between Jew and Samaritan as to the place of sacrifice, and our Lord follows His usual custom of not giving a direct reply to the immediate question, but, by going down to the root of the matter, deals with the fundamental question of the nature of worship. The woman had asked the wrong question. It was not 'Where should we worship—here or on some other mountain?' but 'How should we worship?'—in Spirit and in reality: and 'Whom should we worship?'—the Father. God is Spirit, and therefore the question of here or there is irrelevant.

In the last resort the one controlling and compelling motive to worship is our belief in the essential nature of God as a Spiritual Father. On the one hand it will eliminate all that is unreal and unworthy of Him; and on the other it will brace the mind and purify the motive of the worshipper: and this whether the worship partakes of the dramatic form of sacraments or the didactic form of hymns (or Psalms), prayers, and sermon.

At the same time we need to remind ourselves that to worship in spirit does not necessarily mean that we are to dispense with the aid of material things, as the Quakers try to do. The material is not unspiritual; it is neutral, but it may become sacramental. The contrary to spiritual is not material but formal; and that was just the weakness of Jewish worship—its formality. There was little relationship between religion and life, not from the inherent nature of the worship, but in actual practice; and it was this which occasioned

our Lord's insistence on worship in spirit and in truth.

In endeavouring to carry out our Lord's intention, it is helpful to distinguish between two main types of worship, namely, the dramatic and the didactic, both of which are fully illustrated in the Psalms: for example, Pss 96, 29, 47, etc., for the dramatic type; and Ps 119 *passim*, for the more didactic type. Both types or tendencies persist at the present day. On the one hand there is a demand for more life and movement and colour, and on the other for a more devotional type of service; and the question we clergy have to face is how we are to meet these demands. When we observe the thrill and exultation which the Jew experienced in his form of worship, we need to ask ourselves whether our own form is so flat and uninspiring that it misses that essential element in worship. Might not the demand for life and colour be met by processions, which are easy to arrange, dignified, and impressive? While if the *Book of Prayers for Students*, published by the Student Christian Movement, is an indication of the student mind, it seems that the didactic type will take the form of litanies. The book opens with a series of seven splendid litanies, one for every day of the week, and several other services in litany-form follow, such as a Thanksgiving for the Church, A Litany of Labour, An Intercession for Foreign Missions, etc. The litany form is extremely valuable as it is simple and flexible, and thus may easily be adapted for praise, thanksgiving, penitence, intercession, etc., as the case may be. Furthermore, it is both congregational and devotional, and it is to be hoped that this form will be increasingly used in our Churches.

Sir Henry Hadow described worship on one occasion as 'the highest and most constructive activity of a corporate body.' It is 'the highest,' because it is the response of the soul to the realization of God; the 'most constructive,' because it calls on all the arts to assist it. Yet how many of us, in preparing for our Sunday ministrations, concentrate almost exclusively on the sermon (which, after all, is only part of the whole) to the neglect of the worship? Let us hope that more attention will be devoted to this subject of worship so that we may open men's eyes to the splendour of the vision of God, and help them to see something of the radiance of that unearthly brightness which surrounds Him who is worshipped unceasingly by the hosts of heaven.

Criticism and History.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., D.Th., LONDON.

HAVING studied with care the last German edition of Dr. Dibelius' *Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, and the English translation by Dr. R. Lee Woolf under the title *From Tradition to Gospel*, I gratefully recognize the value of this new development in the literary and the historical criticism of the Gospels. It carries us back behind the literary sources to the older traditions, and thus brings us nearer to the time of the events; it discloses the motives from which, and the manner in which, the traditions assumed their form, and the variety which must, in this respect, be recognized—paradigms, tales, legends, exhortations; it describes the synthesis of these varied elements in the Gospels; it restricts to narrow limits the range of mythology to be conceded; and it confirms the greatness of the historical personality, who made so profound an impression, and exerted so potent an influence that faith in Him as the Christ set this whole process of tradition and literature in motion. This recognition does not, however, involve that I have been fully convinced at all points of the accuracy of the results so reached, or the adequacy of the conception of the Christ to which this method leads. The chapter on Analogies—Rabbinic, Greek, and Patristic—seems to me to ignore the fact that the person is so unique, that the impression He made, the influence He exerted, and thus the faith He evoked were likely to offer a defence against error, a guidance towards truth, which makes comparison of this process of tradition with others not so conclusive as the author thinks. It is not my purpose here to discuss any of the details of the volume; but rather to try and justify my doubt of the assumption that in the arrangement of the materials the Evangelists, and Mark especially, had no traditional guidance as to the course of the ministry. Although I suppose I should regard myself as a layman in these questions, yet I have for a number of years given some attention to them; and the wider theological standpoint may have some value in dealing with them. Some critics seem to me not to see the wood for the trees, and some do not see a whole branch because they are absorbed by one twig. I shall not make assertions with confidence, but ask questions, and offer suggestions with diffidence.

(1) Are the critics generally right in regarding the Synoptic record as so normative that the

witness of the Fourth Gospel is to be, because of disagreement, held suspect? It is admitted by some scholars at least that as regards the time of the Last Supper the Fourth Gospel may preserve a better tradition, and that that Supper was not the Passover meal (Jn 13¹ 19³¹). I know it is assumed by nearly all that the place assigned to the Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics (Mk 11¹⁵⁻¹⁸) is the correct one, and that the record is displaced in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 2¹³⁻²³). But let me urge some considerations on the other side. The Fourth Gospel, by the impression on the disciples recorded and the words of Scripture quoted, indicates that the deed was done in a mood of enthusiasm, the inspiration which had come to full consciousness at the Baptism. Jesus began with prophetic zeal by a challenge of the religious abuses of the nation, testing thus the readiness of the people to respond to His ministry of judgment as well as of grace. Was such a challenge not more probable at the beginning than at the end of the ministry when the shadow of the Cross was already falling on His path, and when He had already discovered that there would be no response? Such a deed was a hopeful summons to repentance at the beginning, it was but 'a forlorn hope' at the end. The entry into Jerusalem in humility upon the ass (Mk 11¹⁻¹⁰) was the fit symbol of His last appeal, as that Cleansing of His first intimation of His mission. The call to the earliest disciples to forsake all and follow Him, and the readiness of their response (Mk 1¹⁶⁻²⁰) gains in probability, if there was some previous contact and conversation, such as the Fourth Gospel records, and if the disciples had been prepared for that first meeting by the ministry of the Baptist (Jn 1²⁹⁻³¹). As they were Galileans, is it not probable that they would be called to constant companionship only when Jesus was compelled by Judæan hostility or a belief which could not be trusted to turn from Jerusalem to Galilee? For repeated visits to Jerusalem it seems to me very weighty reasons can be offered. Is it conceivable that there was only one visit at one Passover to the religious centre of Judaism, where He, coming as the promised Messiah, could offer Himself to by far the largest number of His fellow-countrymen? Would He have dealt fairly with His people, and would He have been justified in the severity of His judgment on their unbelief,

if His appeal in Jerusalem had been restricted as the Synoptic records suggest? Would the lament over Jerusalem (Mt 23³⁷) hold its poignancy, if He had not travelled in pain to bring forth a national repentance, such as Jerusalem alone could offer? If, as has been suggested, the Cleansing of the Temple was the first of at least three Passovers, then the adequate appeal had been made. If there was in Jerusalem after Pentecost a Christian community such as we have no record of in Galilee, it is at least as probable that it was constituted by natives of Jerusalem, who had been prepared by His previous ministry there for their confession of faith, as that many believers migrated from Galilee. The tradition about Mark's connexion with Peter is not to be set aside quite so cavalierly as it often is. There we have a clue to the solution of the problem why the Synoptic record is silent about a Judæan ministry. As a Galilæan, Peter was with Jesus only when He was in Galilee, except on the last visit to Jerusalem, and he reported what he knew from his own experience. On the other hand, the Fourth Gospel gives so distinct indications of familiarity with Jerusalem, indications which it seems to me cannot be explained away as literary realism, that it is probable that the source of the reminiscences, which it enshrines in reflections and theologizings of much later date, is to be sought in a native of Jerusalem, familiar with the details of the ministry in successive visits at the feasts, as no Galilæan disciple was. The Synoptics give no decisive indications of the length of the ministry, except that their contents could be confined to a few months. There is no fatal objection then to the supposition that the ministry did cover the number of feasts, referred to in the Fourth Gospel, a period of at least two years. I have stated all these considerations in much fuller detail in my book, *The Beloved Disciple*, but I have ventured to summarize it here, in the hope that this argument may reach a much larger number of readers than the book has so far secured, as illustrating the contention of this essay that in this minute criticism of the tradition we must not lose sight of this wider historical construction.

(2) It was assumed that there was no certain knowledge of the course of our Lord's ministry, and that the Evangelists arranged the material provided for them by tradition in accordance with their characteristic interest and purpose.

(a) It seems to me, however, on the one hand, incredible that when tradition preserved so much of the content of the ministry, there was no definite remembrance of the general sequence of crucial

events and experiences, and, on the other hand, obvious that the Gospel according to Mark at least has in view a development of faith on the one hand, and unbelief on the other. If as the exponents of this new critical method—*formgeschichte*—held faith in Jesus as the Christ bringing salvation was the motive in the formation of the tradition, then it is not improbable that there survived some traces of how that faith was developed in the company of disciples, but not shared by the Jewish people generally.

(b) The confession at Cæsarea Philippi is, in Mark's Gospel (8²⁷⁻⁹), a watershed, as is generally recognized. It was then that Jesus accepted the confession of His Messiahship, and began to foretell His passion. While the faith of the disciples had reached the stage of this confession, the prediction of the Passion continued to be an offence to them, and their thoughts became more and more unlike His. But there seems to me to be an earlier watershed in the ministry, and that is indicated in the Parable of the Sower (4³⁻⁹). That parable was Jesus' own sorrowful estimate of the partial success of His teaching, and afforded a reason for a change of method in it. Till then there had been direct address to His hearers, now there was symbolic reference to what His cause would prove itself to be. Jesus was poet as well as prophet, and so He habitually used figurative language, but that use of metaphor was clearly different from the use of parable. In the Sermon on the Mount the disciples are addressed as the salt of the earth and the light of the world (Mt 5¹³⁻¹⁶), and even if the primary reference is to those already disciples, it is not yet a closed company, and the appeal is wider. In the parables the Kingdom of God in its characteristics and effects is described in symbols, as mustard-seed and leaven, as an aim and a hope, but not as one being made actual in His hearers.

(c) Is there not a clue to be followed? Jesus had given up the expectation of winning the multitude for the Kingdom; and it would even seem that as regards the disciples themselves He had less confidence that in them the Kingdom would come. May we venture to pursue this inquiry into the inner consciousness of Jesus, in so far as the records give us indications? Into the controversies about the meaning of the title, Son of Man, I need not now enter. Ps 8, Dn 7¹³⁻¹⁴, and Enoch must be taken into account; there is here a combination of exaltation and humiliation, affinity to, and difference from, man. It seems to me certain that the picture of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah (53) gave its more distinctive content to the

conception as indicating humiliation, and Daniel and Enoch as assuming exaltation; and these two complementary aspects—death and resurrection—went together in Jesus' anticipation. It was held by some scholars—whether it is now generally so held, I cannot tell—that the Suffering Servant referred to the nation as a whole, to the remnant and to an individual, a narrowing range of application. The reference in Daniel is not to an individual, but to a community, the reign of which, as human, is contrasted with the empires which it supersedes as bestial. When I wrote my book on *The Inner Life of Jesus* I assumed that the term Son of Man, with the content given by the Suffering Servant had for Jesus an individual reference, and that from the early stages of His ministry He thought of Himself as the solitary suffering Saviour. A difficulty I then recognized, but did not overcome, was the confident appeal made to the multitude, and the disappointment shown when it failed. After much further consideration I would, with much diffidence, offer the following reconstruction of Jesus' inner consciousness. He did anticipate that the people might be won, and might become the martyr-missionary to the other nations for their salvation. Then, following the clue mentioned above, we may conjecture that Jesus recognized that this wider appeal had failed, and concentrated His instruction and influence on His disciples. The call to self-denial and self-sacrifice which follows the announcement of the Passion (Mk 8³⁴) is no vague generality; it is a definite summons to the disciples to become sharers in His sacrifice. The failure of His disciples to respond was even a greater disappointment to Jesus, as He had hoped more from them. The tragedy of His sacrifice was made more poignant by its solitariness. It is possible that the three general announcements of the Passion in the Synoptic Gospels are predictions after the event; but is it not also probable that

there were vague recollections of conversations with Jesus, which were not distinctly remembered, because at the time unheeded, since the thoughts of the disciples were dwelling on other things, as their quarrel about the first place in the Kingdom shows (Mk 9³⁴)? Hence, despite the endeavours of Jesus to forearm by forewarning them, they were not prepared for His sacrifice, to face it calmly and, if need be, to share it with Him bravely (Mk 14⁵⁰). One ingredient in the cup at Gethsemane was this failure of the disciples. Neither nation nor disciples were fit and worthy to be Son of Man and Suffering Servant, but He alone.

(3) A last consideration may here be offered. Dr. Dibelius recognizes that it was faith in Jesus as the Christ which was the motive of the formation of the traditions and their subsequent synthesis in the Gospels. He does not deny the post-Resurrection appearances as confirming that faith. Dr. Goguel, in his book on *The Faith in the Resurrection in the Early Church*, maintains that the records of the appearances were not the supports of that faith, but its products. How great must have been the personality of Jesus, who in so short a ministry made so deep an impression and won so great an influence, that the tragedy of the Cross, although it shook, did not overthrow that faith? That same personality not only once created, but is ever re-creating the Christian Church, the community of believers in Him. One cannot but ask, whether the literary and historical criticism of the Gospels with its comparisons and correlations which tries to bring that personality within the measure of an average manhood is not missing something in the greatness of the personality, the recognition of which is essential to an adequate historical presentation and appreciation of His person and work in the past, as of His continued saving sovereignty throughout the centuries even until our own time.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

The Yacht Race.

BY THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYR.

'There go the ships.'—Ps 104²⁶.

You've seen a yacht race—or ought to. The graceful creatures with their lovely lines, and white

billowing canvas, every sail set, dipping under a fresh breeze till the decks are awash; now changing their course at a turn of the wheel, taking advantage of every breath of wind, manœuvring for position till all the sails are drawing well, and the canvas is straining, and the sea rushing madly past in foam. 'There go the ships!'

One thing you notice is that often a yacht has to sail against the wind. It works its way in a zigzag course, beating to windward or 'tacking,' as we say. It is impossible, of course, to go in the teeth of a contrary wind, but sailors make what use they can of it, creeping forward, now on the port, now on the starboard tack, and so overcome it. They compel what might well drive them back actually to carry them forward—just as brave and plucky people have always done everywhere. Lads of grit learn how to deal with what opposes them, turning to advantage what might otherwise defeat them.

Sometimes you think it is hard lines that you haven't all the chances which some other boys possess. I'm not so sure! A fellow with the right stuff in him won't turn and fly before difficulties, but will compel them to yield some advantage to him. A boy who had not had many opportunities once went to sea as a ship's boy, which, at that time, meant to be abused and cuffed by everybody aboard. By sheer worth of character he gradually rose in business to a position of importance, then to a place of rank in the legal world, until he was finally given a peerage, and became Lord Reading. The first time he visited Calcutta, it was as a ship's boy; the next time he went to that city it was as the King's representative, received with a royal salute of guns as Viceroy of India.

Young people who have grit take difficulties by the right handle. They look upon them as a challenge to their strength. The Master did not say, 'Well done, O fortunate one!' but 'Well done, you who have faithfully served!'

Sometimes the opposition we are up against is in our own nature; it is a fight with something evil in our heart. But in the struggle for the mastery of ourselves with the help of Christ the best kind of manhood is shaped. The battle puts muscle and sinews into character. Did such a heroic man as St. Paul find it always easy to do the right thing? Listen to what he writes: 'I am a boxer who does not beat the air; I bruise my body and make it my slave.' And, mastering himself in that terrible fight with something that threatened his best life, he became a true Christ's man. He made his victorious way against strong head-winds.

And then, have you noticed that in a yacht race all the sails—main, spinnaker, jibs—have their particular part to play? Every one of them counts in the race. A faulty jib lost one of the America Cup races last year.

What is needed to help you win in the big race which life is? Grit? Brain? Character? All of

them. But suppose some part of you were undisciplined, some passion not brought to heel, some bad habit never corrected. Then, when the demand comes, swift and unexpected, you are unprepared. Suppose that weak part of you should fail you, and let you down, you might come to disaster in the race. Here, for instance, is a boy, a bright little fellow, but can you always be certain that he will be there at the time promised? Can you be sure that, when he says a thing, it is so? Is he honour bright?

Some of you, maybe, have a sail that is giving you trouble. It has failed you more than once. Well, this is Sunday, and we have taken a day off to look at our sails, to consider if they have been drawing well. Come to the great Master of Ships, and say, 'Master, this sail is failing me. Fit me a new one, and help me to sail well, above all to sail fair, and, if that may be, to win.' And He will.

Working Together.

BY THE REVEREND ALEX. SMALL, B.D.,
BOREHAM WOOD, HERTS.

'Workers together with him.'—2 Co 6¹.

Some time ago I was watching some girls plait the maypole. In and out the girls went as the music was played, round and round until the ribbons formed a beautiful pattern on the pole. One thing the girls had to remember and that was to work together. If they had forgotten that even for a short time they would have spoiled everything: the ribbons would have become entangled and the pattern spoiled.

That is what God wants us to do—to work together. He has a pattern which He wants us to make, but it can never be completed unless we all work together. Most of the horrid things in this world come about because people won't work together. They think of themselves and care nothing about others.

Some of you boys play cricket; and you know you can only have the best game when you all work together. Fancy any one refusing to work with the others on the field, running only when he hit the ball, or fielding just when and where he liked. What a failure he would be. He would spoil the game both for himself and for others. 'That's not cricket,' you would say, and you would be right. I saw some school sports recently, and there was a relay race. How wonderfully they worked together as they ran for the honour of their House. If only one had failed to work in with the others, the whole race would have proved a failure.

So it is with all team games, you must think of others and of the success of the team.

So it is in the game of life, the greatest game of all and the most important that we have to play. Some try to play the game for themselves: they are always thinking of themselves and working for themselves, or when they think of others it is only because they must. They're selfish, like Jack in the Nursery Rhyme:

Little Jack Horner sat in a corner
Eating his Christmas pie.

He didn't ask his sister or brother or mother or any one else to share it with him. But people like that are never happy, and they are never successful. They spoil God's pattern for the world as well as for themselves. We need to work together, to think of others, to help others, to do our little bit, whatever it is, like the girls in the plaiting of the maypole. We must not say: 'Oh, my little bit won't make any difference, and so I won't bother about it.' It will make a lot of difference. If we don't do it, God will never be able to make our life beautiful, and there will be something missing in His pattern for the world because we have failed to do our part. But when we do our share, and work together with others, we are really working together with God.

The Christian Year.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Discipline in Detail.

'Thou therefore endure hardness.'—2 Ti 2³.

We have heard with joy of the 'glorious liberty of the children of God,' or that 'we have been called unto liberty.' We like to hear St. Paul speak with scorn of those who, having been called unto liberty, have none the less returned to the weak and beggarly elements and are in bondage—observing days and months and times and years.

There is a very splendid truth behind all that St. Paul says—that it is possible to live life under the power of an inspiration, and not under the compulsion of law, and living under an inspiration is joy and freedom, while living under law is a miserable affair. It may be the inspiration of a hunger for knowledge, or it may be the inspiration of love of our country, or of pity for those who are oppressed, or the inspiration of a sense of beauty, or the inspiration of love—love for some man or some woman. And life under the compulsion of any of these inspirations has a fine quality in it.

It has a swing and a meaning in it. On the other hand, crawling through life under the compulsion of mere rules is a miserable business, unworthy of human beings. 'Ye were called unto liberty. See, then, that ye be not entangled in the yoke of bondage.'

Further still, of all the inspirations which can redeem life the greatest is love for Christ—it is greatest because it includes all other great inspirations. It will drive a man or a woman happily along any of the great lines of human endeavour, because they are all relevant to the coming of the Kingdom. Indeed, love of Christ will redeem occupations that are in themselves unpleasant. George Herbert has three very characteristic lines in which he says:

Nothing can be so mean,
Which with this tincture (*for thy sake*)
Will not grow bright and clean.

But there is something more to be said. There is a well-known architect who is very happy in this respect that he does get real inspirations. He gets conceptions for his buildings which seem to be given to him, and when one has come to him he is filled with joy. But what happens next? Why, he has to settle down to draw plans and frame estimates, and face the drudgery of a thousand details. He has to cut out many pleasures that otherwise might come into his life, and keep himself fit in body and mind to put through the task fastened upon him by his inspiration.

It is so in every great calling—first comes some great conception and then almost infinite care in attending to details, that the conception may at last be clothed with life. All great works of art have been paid for in that way. So have all great achievements in engineering, or business, or social administration.

It may be true that a few erratic men of genius can give great gifts to the world though they are quite undisciplined in their habits. But for us there has to be discipline in detail or else we shall fail to live to any fine purpose.

There are two conditions of true discipline. First of all it must be self-imposed. The reason why army discipline so conspicuously fails to make true men is that it is imposed from without, so that as soon as the upholding influence of sergeant-majors is removed men fall down into failure. That, too, is the essential weakness of Roman Catholic discipline. It is imposed upon individuals by officials, and it keeps individuals in the status of children. Is not that the explanation of the fact

that countries under Roman Catholic control are almost never progressive countries?

And the second thing about true discipline is that it must be imposed for some great positive end. Mere discipline for its own sake only makes life ugly and dull. That is the weakness of mere Puritanism. It abounds in restrictions, but it does not always point men and women on to any great positive end, and so it fails to put dignity and meaning into life. Mere repression without any expression in some other direction must always be bad. We can quite believe all the serious things which the psychologists say about it. But if, for the sake of some great and positive expression of ourselves in one direction, we impose restrictions upon ourselves, we are only following the unchanging law which lays down the conditions of achievement.

Begin with the body. Every year sixteen university students from Oxford and Cambridge want to bring their bodies to high efficiency in order to win the Boat Race, and so they live hard and very simple lives under an iron discipline which they accept for the sake of a great end. If we want to have bodies which will stand up to our daily work, and keep healthy and give us pleasure in games, we, too, must learn to discipline them. We must make our own rules about sleep, and food, and cold baths. We must cut out alcohol, and ration our tobacco, and so on.

The same thing is true of our minds. If we want to have efficient and useful minds they must have discipline. They do not naturally want to attend to anything with efficiency. They tend to wander and be slack. We have to choose the books we want to read and then go on till they are finished. We have got to hold our thoughts on particular subjects until we come to some understanding of them. We have got to train our memories, or else they will fail us. And nothing can achieve these results except mental discipline. It is the same thing with the will. It is a troublesome customer. If we do not use our will daily it will go to sleep.

The same thing comes out when we watch any organization. Its efficiency always depends upon the extent to which the people in it have disciplined themselves in doing their parts regularly, punctually, and cheerfully.

The same thing is true in many connexions. If a man wants to be a true and successful lover he has to face the same eternal law. For love's sake he will have to learn to control and manage himself—his body, his temper, his selfishness, his queer personal ways. And as to marriage, it is even

more utterly the case that without discipline it cannot be a success. The prizes in that part of life, which are great and wonderful, have all to be earned and then preserved by discipline in detail.

And lastly, the same thing is true of our spiritual lives. It is here that we Protestants often make our most serious mistakes. We look at Muhammadans going through five acts of prayer per day, and say, 'How formal and superficial.' We look at Roman Catholics, who observe matins and vespers and complines, etc. etc., and say the same over again. Our position is that religion is a matter of the heart, and that if in our hearts we love Christ all will go well.

'Is it true that if we love Christ all goes well without any regularity and discipline in our inner lives? Are we getting on truly and well, and growing in understanding of Christ, and in the power to do His work, without discipline in our personal lives?'

We find in life so many rivals to interest in Christ. There are all the pleasures and hobbies of life, and books of all sorts, and the current interests of the world, and people. And there is the round of daily work which may not ever remind us of Christ. And if He is not to be crowded into a corner, and sometimes forgotten, then we need to find time for Him, and that means we need to submit ourselves to discipline in detail in relation to our spiritual life. To learn to pray we need to practise. And in all this we are not returning to the weak and beggarly elements of the Law. We are giving the glorious gospel of the blessed God a chance to hold us still. We are learning to live on the basis of the glorious liberty of the children of God.¹

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Pharisaism.

'Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.'—Mt 5²⁰.

A witty Frenchman has defined hypocrisy as the homage that vice pays to virtue. There would be no advantage gained in rendering such homage, unless virtue were a real thing and commanded respect. By affecting such virtue hypocrisy seeks to gain the advantages that flow from it. Hypocrisy is thus a testimony to the truth and excellence of virtue—and a testimony extorted from its enemies. The hypocrisy of the Pharisees is incontrovertible evidence that in their own time and

¹ A. H. Gray, *Jesus, and the Art of Living*, 71.

earlier a form of true religion flourished, which counted amongst its adherents the soundest elements of the nation.

The Pharisees are to be traced back to the Chasidim, who were already a definite party in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Syrian king who attempted to destroy Judaism and substitute in its stead the worship of the gods of Greece. Now it was the Chasidim that gave up their lives in thousands in defence of their religion, and ultimately under the great Maccabean leaders secured alike the faith and the liberty of their country. These Chasidim were rigid upholders of the Law. We are told that on one occasion, when the armies of Antiochus came upon them when engaged in worship on the Sabbath day, they offered no resistance, since it was the Sabbath day, but fell as they stood by the swords of the Syrians.

However corrupt their party became in later times, it was incomparably noble in its early days. When they first took action in the history of the nation, they did so as the champions of the Law over against the Hellenizing Sadducees. And not only did these early Pharisees zealously study the Law, they were also the chief and unrivalled representatives of learning in Judaism. In this respect they created an aristocracy of learning over against the aristocracy of rank possessed by the Sadducees. And yet, if the glorification of learning leads to such pride of intellect, and scorn and excommunication of the ignorant, as it did amongst the Pharisees, men of ordinary common sense would naturally question its utility, and ask if it were not more of an evil than a good.

The Pharisees as early as the second century B.C. had become the popular saints of Judaism, and the temptation to assume the outward form and profession of these religious leaders was more than the ambitious and self-seeking youths of that age could withstand. Besides, such imitation was particularly easy. Since the outer life of the Pharisee was so taken up with ritual and ceremonial observances, as well as with casuistical indulgences and evasions where the precepts of the Law were too severe, it was a matter of the greatest difficulty to distinguish between the true Pharisee and the Pharisee who was a hypocrite. In fact, the false Pharisee is censured as early as the second century before Christ. Thus a Jewish writer towards the close of that century condemns the double-faced character of those who fast in public but are guilty of impurity in private; he visits with the same censure those who give largely to the poor yet in business transactions are fraudulent and merciless.

But our Lord's denunciations of the Pharisees were directed, not against the conscious hypocrites of this party, but against those who were unconscious that they were hypocrites. The former there was no need of denouncing. But the self-deceived or unconscious Pharisees belonged to quite a different category. They not only deceived others, they had actually succeeded in deceiving themselves; and they even believed that they had succeeded in deceiving God, and that God had taken them at their own valuation. In the classical passage on this subject—the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican—the Pharisee is quite sincere in thanking God that he is such an excellent man and that he is free from the sins of the rest of mankind.

How did the Pharisees come to believe in themselves, unless at some crisis in their lives they had been individually honest with themselves? If a man is free from such sins as impurity, intemperance, and gluttony, it means that at some time in his life he won at no small cost a moral victory over appetites which are difficult to curb. We may grant that some men may master these appetites through prudence and through fear of the penalties that attend on their wrong indulgence. But with the bulk of normally developed men it takes something more than prudence to reduce to their rightful obedience these strong and rebellious appetites. Indeed, most men find that nothing short of the immediate help of God's Spirit can save them. Now, what does this mean? It means just this, that the bulk of the self-deceived Pharisees condemned by Christ were at some period of their lives sincere and honest men, and it was with a consciousness of the sincerity and righteousness of their motives that they had entered on their religious profession.

Starting from this time, when they could rightly believe in themselves, we can now understand how, though their sincerity did not extend to the whole province of their religious experience, this early belief in themselves persisted. During the years in which they were actively obedient to God's Spirit they acquired certain habits that were blameless and unexceptionable, and thus became assured that they were true servants of God. But habits, however unexceptionable, are not religion; they are not faith, nor hope, nor love, but are the product of these graces. All these graces require the religious life to be progressive, to be ever advancing, ever working from purer motives and acting with increase of power and sacrifice. But habits are essentially stationary. When these spiritual graces cease to grow and act, there follows an arrest

of spiritual development, and religion becomes synonymous with a routine of religious and social duties, whether self-devised or imposed from without by a religious community. Now, just because they have become a routine, this phase of Pharisaism fails to touch the deeper faults of character, the covetousness and greed, the meanness, jealousies, hatreds, and ambitions, and all the vices of the spirit, which under such excellent cover have gone on growing all the time; and, because the victims of such Pharisaism have done certain good works, used certain theological phrases, observed certain ritual observances, they have gone on thinking themselves good and been accepted as such by their neighbours; nay, more, have believed themselves to be regarded as such by God.

Regarded outwardly, good deeds and good habits, when they have become purely mechanical, may appear to have a spiritual worth, but they have, of course, no claim to this distinction. And yet such achievements naturally impose on the world, and this deception of others necessarily reacts on its authors and confirms them in their self-delusion. Actions which are outwardly good and which should be the expression of inwardly good motives are taken at their face value, and those who perform them are more and more accepted to be that which they are not. The Pharisee is thus at once the author and the victim of the deception under which he labours.

The self-delusion of the Pharisee our Lord ascribes to their failure to use the same intelligence and judgment in their religious concerns as they used daily in their secular affairs. This argument He drives home in the words, 'When it is evening, ye say, It will be fine weather: for the heaven is red. And in the morning, It will be foul weather to-day; for the heaven is red and lowering. Ye know how to discern the face of the heaven, but ye cannot discern the signs of the times.' When men will not be guided in religious matters by such evidence as they act on in daily life, they are either the slaves of tradition or the victims of prejudice.

When the right of such judgment is denied to the members of a church, it is no wonder that they become the helpless slaves of ignorance, deceit, and superstition. And the deeper their ignorance and superstition the greater their arrogance becomes, their self-complacency, and their contempt for such as refuse to bow to the same obscurantist yoke.

The three main lessons we are to learn from studying Pharisaism are: First, we must see to it

that we are not double-minded. Our conduct must not suggest high spiritual motives while in our hearts we cherish another class of motives conflicting directly with them. To be single-minded is the first requisite, but this is not in itself sufficient. The typical Pharisee of Christ's time believed in his own honesty, even when he was not honest. Similarly, Pius v. was thoroughly confident that he was the true representative of Christ when he was most unchristian, and committed to the flames or to the sword all who questioned the creed he dictated. We need two other graces, and the first of these is humility. And by humility we mean not only a readiness to accept reproof when we are wrong and to amend our ways, but also an openness of mind to all truth from whatever quarter it comes. Humility thus means a never-failing openness to spiritual, moral, and intellectual truth, attended with the obedience that such disclosures require. But there is yet a third requisite. Christ summed up all duty in the grace of love, and St. Paul declared, 'Love is the fulfilling of the law.'

And whilst with Christ's help we honestly strive to practise these graces, we should beware of trying to appear better than we are, or of pretending to some grace or excellence or knowledge in which we are lacking. We need not trouble about the opinion of others, nor about the influence we are wielding; so far as we are really followers of Christ, we cannot fail to influence others for good, for whatever of God's light there is in us will shine before men, and shine before them in such a fashion that they will glorify not us but our Father in heaven.¹

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Guidance.

'And they went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia; and when they were come over against Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia; and the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not; and passing by Mysia, they came down to Troas. And a vision appeared to Paul in the night; There was a man of Macedonia standing, beseeching him, and saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us. And when he had seen the vision, straightway we sought to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us for to preach the gospel unto them.'—Ac 16⁸⁻¹⁰ (R.V.).

'"Direction! I know very well what you mean by direction," said Mrs. Poyser, knitting in a rapid and

¹ R. H. Charles, *The Adventure into the Unknown*, 103.

agitated manner. "When there's a bigger maggot than usual in your head you call it 'direction.'"

What provoked this outburst was a remark dropped by Dinah Morris, the Methodist preacher in *Adam Bede*, during a conversation with Mrs. Poyser. The words tingled with scorn. It seemed nothing short of preposterous that she should be so sure of Divine guidance! Yet much more than Mrs. Poyser's scepticism would have been needed to drive that conviction from Dinah's soul.

One need not agree with all that the Oxford Groups say about guidance to be deeply in debt to them for the very practical way in which they have forced this question upon us. Theism is but another word for belief in a guided universe, and if we are Christian theists, we are committed to the position that God is our Father, and must therefore guide us. But one of the difficulties of life is to feel this in practice, above all to feel it at the times when we need it most, and this difficulty does not come simply from the fact that we have not surrendered ourselves to God. The whole situation is more complex than that. It will help us if we look at the course of St. Paul. Without doubt he was guided by God, and in our text we see the turns of the Divine hand. We have no wish to rule out what may be called supernatural intimations; rather we wish to suggest the ways in which they may come to us, and there are three forms which we would specially consider. God guides us by a distinct and powerful impression on the mind, by imperative circumstances, and, thirdly, through the exercise of our own judgments.

1. Paul had an impression that he ought not to go into Asia, and a conviction that this impression came from God. We are all of us conscious at times of certain strong inward impressions as to what we should do, and we may regard many of these impulses and restraints as the hand of God upon us. How are we to distinguish these impressions, promptings, and checks of the Spirit from the impulses and shrinkings of our own hearts? We cannot always say, but one criterion is that for these higher impulses we often can give no reason. Especially we have the conviction that these guiding impressions come from the higher regions of our nature through our conscience. We feel that it would be wrong to resist them.

Guidance led F. Herbert Stead to the slums. Drawn away, first from a settled pastorate, then from the claims of academic study, and finally from religious journalism, he found himself in a maze of contradictory counsel from his many friends.

'Amid these conflicting claims I could only cry

for clear guidance from the Directing will. One day the answer came. As I knelt and prayed, there was laid upon me the mandate that I, my wife and children, should ourselves go and reside among the London Poor to serve them in every way open to us . . . the mandate was not, as the subjectivist is eager to suggest, the sublimated exhalation of my own judgment and desires. I am wholly ashamed to confess that my submission to the mandate was attended with little or no gladness. It came, not from me. It came from without, from above me.'¹

And to what did the mandate lead? It led first to the conversion of the Browning Hall Mission, Walworth, into the Browning Settlement, and then to the most titanic work for Peace, Purity, Old Age Pensions, Old Age Homes, the Unemployed, Slum Clearance, and better Housing.

These convictions come to us very often in the moment of our prayer, or as we calmly sit in the sanctuary, when the clear white light of God shines through our souls, and His Spirit is sensibly moving through our hearts. Robert Barclay knew the secret. He said, 'When I came into the silent assemblies of God's people, I felt a secret power among them which touched my heart; and, as I gave way unto it, I found the evil weakening in me and the good raised up.'

There is another passage in the Acts of the Apostles which is very similar to the passage we have been considering, but where the guidance is more distinctly corporate. 'Now there were at Antioch, in the church that was there, prophets and teachers. . . . And as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.' In this passage much the same language is used, and probably there is much the same state of mind. A strong impression settled on the minds of the leaders of the community that the Church was being called to a new venture. Here we see guidance coming to a community, and wherever guidance can be obtained in this way, a large measure of authority can be claimed for it. As numbers increase there is, of course, the danger of suggestion, but this danger can be obviated by care and discipline. We see these last operating in this very narrative. It was as these men ministered to the Lord and fasted that the guidance came. And the guidance of the Group will, in normal circumstances, be something larger than that of the individual.

2. God guides us by the force of imperative cir-

¹ F. Herbert Stead, *The Unseen Leadership*, II, 14.

circumstances. In writing to the Galatians Paul tells them, 'But ye know that because of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you the first time.' We are continually being prevented from doing things we long to do by imperative circumstances, and we are in danger of thinking that our course is shaped by chance, or the unfeeling forces of the world. Let us always bear in mind that these things which seem to come as it were by chance are taken into the purpose of God, that these events and conditions which are too strong for us are plastic in His hands. Indeed, there are always two sides from which we may regard these things. In the Letter to the Corinthians Paul regards the thorn in the flesh as the messenger of Satan: in his ministry in Galatia it almost seems as though he had regarded it as the providence of God. It may have been implanted in his body by Satan, but later on it was taken into the hands of the good Spirit. It was sent to buffet: it was made to guide.

3. We are guided through the exercise of our own judgments. We see this clearly illustrated in the case of the Apostle at Troas. After his journey through Asia Minor he has reached the coast. The sea opens up its broad pathways before him: on his left and right and behind him there are other roads. Which way is he to take? There is now no imperative voice sending him this way rather than that. He has to look at all the circumstances, and form his own judgment. He says, 'we endeavoured to go into Macedonia assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us.' The word that is used in the Greek (*συμβιβάζοντες*) means the putting of things together, the joining of one consideration to another. At night his seething thoughts worked themselves, as dominant desires will, into a dream. But we must notice that it was no imperative vision. It was not God who came and charged him to preach the gospel on the other shore. It was only a man of Macedonia, such a one as he might have spoken to on the beach, with a pathetic cry for help. All these things Paul put together, and he gathered that God had called him to the other side.

At times we seem to be left to ourselves in a dark world, and it is easy and natural for us to think that we are forsaken and forgotten by God. But when we look calmly at the whole matter we see that it is best that we should be left to the exercise of our own faculties. This is necessary for our training. God treats us as men that He may make men of us. We open up the confused depths of our soul, our thoughts, our longings, our passions to

His influences. Indeed, if we go back upon our experience, we shall see that we have never been brought so near to God as during the seasons when we have been compelled to take on the responsibility of choice. And we must not think that making decisions by the exercise of our own judgment means that we are deprived of the guidance of God. Paul was as surely led to Macedonia as he was to Phrygia. Our restless mind is the loom in which His patterns are woven.

But of this guidance there are two conditions. One is that we make the best use of our judgment. We must not think the matter half through, and then give up, and say, 'Oh, God will guide me.' The other is that we have a sincere desire to get at the will of God.¹ The promise is, 'This is the way, walk ye in it.' Is our first thought, as it was Christ's, in everything as it arises to discover what is the will of God for me concerning this? By what course would I serve Him best? Here am I ready and willing to be used as He determines, if only He will let me see what His will for me is. Cleanthes of old used a wise prayer:

Lead me, O God, and Thou, O Fate,
Thine appointment I await.
Only lead me. I will go
With no flagging steps, nor slow;
Or if I degenerate be,
And consent reluctantly,
Still, God, I do follow Thee.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

What Christ means to me.

'For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.'—Ph r²¹.

'As life means Christ to me, so death means gain' (Moffatt).

As the text stands in the Authorized Version it seems to suggest two separate and not necessarily related ideas. As it stands in Moffatt's translation, the real sequence is given. 'As life means Christ to me, so death means gain.' These are not two statements, but one declaration. The Apostle has learned to read everything in terms of Christ. 'All things are yours,' he says in another place, 'whether life or death, things present or things to come; all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's.'

In a recent letter from England there occurs a paragraph. 'I went to the Presbyterian Church last Sunday. It was an elderly minister who was

¹ J. A. Chapman, *The Supernatural Life*, 172.

preaching. His text was, "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." He began by saying: "The first sentence applies to youth, the second to old age. The young man, beginning his work and service for God, should have this aim, to live Christ; but it would be cant for him to say, 'to die is gain.' Death is not near. The old man has finished his work and thinks of death as gain." This surely misses the whole point. There is neither youth nor age in this deathless declaration, which should be the normal declaration of every Christian life. It is not a question of finishing one's work or the term of one's natural life. It is a question of living Christ. There can be no end to that. If it is true that a Christian can never finish living Christ, surely death can make no difference. To Paul it made no difference, not because he was an old man, but because he was a Christian. Life came to have for him a new value and quality, an eternal meaning and significance; as it came to have for us, the moment we came into a real experience of Christ. We could say, "This *is* life eternal," here and now begun. There was at the time a sense of having *faced death*, of having passed from death to life. Yet, we are told that "it would be cant for youth to say 'to die is gain,' because death is not near." Must not the youth face death? He had to face it during the War, and to face the whole terrors and pains of violent death, the youth of a whole generation.'

They laid the world away; poured out the red Sweet wine of youth; gave up the years to be Of work and joy, and that unhopèd serene,
That men call age; and those who would have been

Their sons, they gave, their immortality.

They did that for a cause they believed in. Many of them, who had no real experience of Christ, who certainly could not have said that life meant Christ to them, were able bravely to count the world well lost and give their life away, and to think of death as gain, if not to themselves personally, at least to the cause for which they were willing to die.

But here is something much more wonderful. 'For me to live is Christ, and to die—more Christ.' That is really what it means. 'As life means Christ to me, so death means gain.' He has found an absolute equation for life.

There are so many things that life might mean. Think of some of the values we set before ourselves: ambition, love of power, of position in society, love of money, just because of the power and position it can bring, love of pleasure. 'For

me to live is Self.' That, in a general way, describes the life of any one of us, before Christ comes to have any real meaning. But think for a moment what this statement involves: 'Life means *Christ* to me.'

A professor of comparative religions—an agnostic as far as Christianity was concerned—once asked Sadhu Sundar Singh, the great Christian mystic, 'What have you found in Christianity that you did not have in your old religion?'

The Sadhu answered, 'I have Christ.'

'Yes, I know,' the professor replied, a little impatiently, for he was hoping for a philosophical argument, 'but what particular principle or doctrine have you found that you did not have before?'

The Sadhu replied, 'The particular thing I have found is Christ.'

The non-Christian faiths have fine things in them, but they lack—Christ.¹

To live Christ means nothing short of the absolute. This was Emerson's chief objection to Jesus Christ, that He was not satisfied with a segment of life, but had to have a complete whole. It is true of His claim on our affections. 'Thou shalt love the Lord with *all* thine heart.' It is only when Christ becomes the ground of our affections that the old nature begins to wither away, self-love in all its forms. It is then that we come to love with the affection of Christ Himself. The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, when we yearn for the souls of men with the heart of Christ Himself. The same applies to relationships and all interests that have proved to be too demanding and absorbing. It may be even one's reading. John Watt, of Edinburgh, tells us that a bookstore was his drug shop.

'Christ is either all in all or nothing at all,' says Hudson Taylor. That is our constant challenge, our daily inspiration and the promise of our peace. And to think that we once thought it possible to include Christ in the multiplicity of our interests! As Professor William Manson somewhere says, 'We proposed to annex Christ rather than to be annexed by Him.' It means nothing less than to be annexed by Him. Day by day there must be surrender to Him of this or that part of territory still in our own possession; or, as Amy Carmichael puts it in *Gold Cord*, 'there is always something more in our nature which He wills to mark with the Cross.'

It is possible to be surrendered on the surface and not in the depths; and, until we allow Christ

¹ E. Stanley Jones, *The Christ of the Indian Road*, 63.

to reach down to the depths of our nature, we can have no constant and lasting sense of security, freedom, and peace. It is not only that Christ can save to the uttermost all that come to God by Him, but that He can save to the uttermost of each and every one of us.

To die must be gain, for it will mean the death of all that is not of Christ in us. Paul could say that 'he died daily'; he was always being delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in his mortal flesh.

Archbishop Temple says: 'The deepest sins in the nature of most of us are sins we have not yet discovered; and they are often associated with something about us with which we are particularly well satisfied.' It is a startling way of putting it, but there is no doubt it is true. It may sound depressing, for it means that we are only beginning to know the freedom with which Christ would make us free. But it is a most heartening and comforting doctrine; for it means that such is our nature that Christ will be busy with us to the very end; that we shall have Him and need Him every moment of every day of this mortal life. Paul himself confessed that he had not yet attained the life of full consecration. 'Brothers,' he says, 'I for one do not consider myself to have appropriated this; my one thought is by forgetting what lies behind me'—the record of good achievement as well as of bad deeds—'and reaching out to what lies before me, to press on to the goal for the prize of God's high call in Christ Jesus.' It reminds us of St. Bernard of Clairvaux in his hymn:

Jesus, our only joy be Thou,
As Thou our prize wilt be;
Jesus, be Thou our glory now,
And through eternity.

There is no hard-and-fast distinction between hither and yonder, between time and eternity. It is the same experience of glory and joy right through time and eternity. Such a soul had found in Jesus a new equation for life, which was commensurate with life itself, at all its points and furthest reaches; yes, and he had found a new equation for God. 'This is eternal life, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.' That is what the world needs to-day; not a new scientific formula for space-time, but a new equation for God. We have it in Jesus Christ, in His Almighty Saviourhood, and in His Will for world redemption. We must think in terms of God's plan for world redemption, through the Cross of Jesus Christ. Eddington may have a formula which he himself alone can understand, and Einstein may have another, equally beyond our comprehension; but there is a formula that we can all understand, an equation for life that solves all problems of existence and resolves all antinomies. 'This is life eternal,' now actually begun, possible under mortal conditions. Unless we have such an equation we cannot, with any confidence, stand up against the present situation and say, 'We have the answer,' and proceed at once to prove it beyond doubt. We shall only be able to say, 'It can't be done,' and go on to make the best of things; which is pretty much what we have been doing for a generation. That is just adapting ourselves to circumstances; but we must adapt ourselves to God. As Principal Cairns has said: 'If we adapt ourselves to the reality, the freedom and the love of God, there may be some standing here that shall not taste of death till they see the Kingdom of God come with power.'¹

¹ E. Macmillan, *Finding and Following*, 179.

Sir Thomas More.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUNBARTONSHIRE.

THIS month will witness a widespread revival of interest in the life and works of Sir Thomas More, who has been recently canonized by the Head of the Roman Catholic Church: for it is exactly four hundred years ago on the 6th of July 1935 since that great and good man was executed on Tower Hill for refusing to acknowledge King Henry

the Eighth's claim to supremacy in the Church of England. No one had been more loyal or forbearing towards that proud and arrogant monarch than his Chancellor: but, although More was 'the king's loyal servant,' he was, as he was heard to say on the scaffold, 'God's servant first.'

Every one, of course, knows that More was the

author of *Utopia*, that sportive and original description of an ideal commonwealth. From very early times, men have portrayed their ideal world. Plato in his 'Republic' gave us a model which supplied ideas for subsequent essayists, and since his day there has been a continuous stream of similar pictures of the perfectly ordered world. Bacon's 'New Atlantis,' Swift's 'Gulliver's Travels,' Samuel Butler's 'Erewhon,' and William Morris's 'News from Nowhere' continue the list of English Utopias to which Mr. H. G. Wells, Mr. Bernard Shaw, and Mr. Aldous Huxley in his 'Brave New World' have also made notable contributions.

It was while he was in Flanders on a mission that Thomas More began that book which was to make his name so famous throughout civilized Europe, and by which we remember him still to-day. The setting of the book was unusual and such as to excite the curiosity of the general reader. One Raphael Hythlodaye, a Portuguese sailor, falls into conversation with Peter Giles and More, who draw forth from this thoughtful reformer his ideas for the social betterment of mankind and his views on that happy life and blessed world, where jewels and money are despised, and where 'war is a thing very beastly'; and 'nothing is counted so much against glory as glory gotten in war.'

The book, which was written in Latin and was published in 1516, was a charming mixture of fact and fiction, and under guise of this delightful framework, More was able to set forth, half in jest and half in earnest, the most revolutionary or reactionary ideas and at the same time to disclaim all responsibility for them. For did they not all emanate from the island of Nusquam (nowhere)? The chief object he had in view was to draw the attention of influential men to the political and social injustices of his day and generation, to the poverty and hardships of many of his fellows, and to the greed and aggrandisement of the great land-owners of the country. *Utopia* is topical and must be read in the light of current events. The introductory book (the second) contains an impassioned attack on the commercial revolution of the sixteenth-century old nobility. More makes an eloquent and moving plea on behalf of the evicted labourers driven by want to crime, and also for the great religious houses which had suffered through the civil wars.

We must bear in mind, as has been said, that much of what More writes is set down in fun, and, accordingly, must not take too literally the sug-

gestions that an equal division of wealth would ensure an abundance for all, and that this equal division cannot be made unless private property be utterly abolished. As a matter of fact, More clearly states that he is unable to accept *simpliciter* all that Hythlodaye has suggested. He held that life would never be satisfactory where all things were in common. For surely 'the rich man's substance is the well-spring of the poor man's living.'

It has been remarked that More, who was a whole-hearted Catholic, made *Utopia* a non-Christian country. This was doubtless done, partly in the interests of probability, and partly because he wished to attribute to Utopians a freedom of thought and practice inadmissible by Christians. But this need not be pressed by his critics. His whole life showed that, to him, the truth of Christianity was incontestable, and while he often called in question the practices of churchmen, he never failed to defend the principles of the Church itself. Communists have hailed *Utopia* in all seriousness as a text-book for their cause, but the spirit of brotherhood alone was the basis of More's communism.

Education.—Thomas More was the eldest son of Master, afterwards Sir John, More, a Judge in the Court of the King's Bench, and was born in Milk Street in the City of London on the 17th February in the year 1478. He came of a good if not illustrious family. As a boy, he lived in the household of Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury, and, through his influence, was sent to Canterbury College (merged in Christ Church), Oxford, where he remained from 1492 to 1494. His father kept him on 'short rations' there and arranged a course of plain living and high thinking for the undergraduate in order to wean him from any softness developed in Morton's household. At Oxford the youthful Thomas threw himself with ardour into the New Learning, which was then reaching the ancient universities of England. After leaving Oxford, Thomas More studied at New Inn, and afterwards at Lincoln's Inn, and duly became a barrister.

The Friend of Erasmus.—It was while he was reading for the bar that More met Erasmus sitting at the same table, but unknown to him except by name. As he listened to the wit and wisdom of More, Erasmus, so the story runs, exclaimed, 'You are no one if not More,' to meet with the repartee, 'and you are Erasmus or the devil,' which sally was meant as a compliment to Erasmus' skill and subtlety in argument. This was the

beginning of a warm and intimate friendship which lasted till More's death. These two had much in common. They laughed at the same jokes and loved the same books. Erasmus' famous book '*Encomium Moriae*' was written at More's house in Chelsea, and the title of it was a slight play on the name of his host. In matters ecclesiastical, too, they saw eye to eye. More's eyes were as open as those of Erasmus to the abuses of the Church, and to the vulgar superstitions and errors and loose living of many of the friars and priests. More, like Erasmus, saw the wisdom and virtue of religious toleration, but both eventually recoiled from what they regarded as the excesses and fanaticism of the Reformers. More, in particular, drove himself farther back, and during his latter years became the determined thoroughgoing apologist of all the abuses of the old system. The truth was he feared heresy as a form of poisonous epidemic, which, if allowed to spread unchecked, would overthrow all government, whether secular or ecclesiastical, to the moral and material ruin of the Christian world. It is in the light of this overwhelming conviction of More's that we must regard what is one of the saddest incidents in his literary life—his scornful hostility to Tyndale's noble translation of the Bible. A pitiable thing it is to see these two saintly souls condescending to the vilest language in their violent abuse of one another in the name of religion. Yet so it was.

A Pioneer in Women's Education.—More had decided leanings towards the life of a religious recluse, but he made up his mind to remain in the world, and in 1504 he married Jane Colt, who died leaving him with four young children. After his second marriage, More removed from Bucklersbury in the City of London to Chelsea, then a peaceful riverside hamlet. The house was large and comfortable; near by was his library, a gallery and private chapel, which he used for prayer and meditation. More's household was conducted in the patriarchal style, and many relatives lived together under the same roof, but he ruled over them all by his kindness. William Roper, his son-in-law, who lived sixteen years with him, said he 'could never perceive him as much as once in a fume.' More's three elder children were daughters, girls of a high level of intelligence, and he maintained the practice of equal instruction for the sexes, and in this way did as much to advance the education of girls in England as John Colet did for boys at his school of St. Paul's. He was deeply interested in natural history and astronomy, and delighted to study with his children the forms and habits of different

creatures. In his house and garden he kept a strange and numerous collection of birds and animals—dogs, rabbits, foxes, ferrets, weasels, and a monkey. Latin composition was practised and improved by correspondence, and his enforced absences abroad yielded those charming letters to his children of which too few survive. In after years they remembered the way in which their father turned the driest subject into a delightful pastime, and the quaint and homely sayings with which he encouraged them to love religion.

A Busy Lawyer.—Thomas More very soon became a popular barrister and his services were greatly sought after. He became a member of Parliament, and made his mark by his independence of judgment and by his courageous outspokenness. He became Under-Sheriff of London, and attracted the attention of Cardinal Wolsey, Henry VIII.'s great minister. Knighted in 1521, he became Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in 1525, and at length, on 25th October 1529, the King invited him, after Wolsey's fall, to become Lord Chancellor of England. According to Erasmus, More was 'dragged' into the circle of the Court. But though his ascent of the steps of the official ladder was rapid, he never became self-important. It is told how, as Lord Chancellor, he sang as a chorister in the village choir of Chelsea Parish Church, and every morning sought his father's blessing before proceeding to the courts. Least of all was he elated by his intimate friendship with the King, whose character from the outset he had summed up very accurately. One day in More's garden at Chelsea, the King was walking with him with his heavy arm about his neck. When Roper congratulated him on his intimacy with his sovereign and on such evident signs of royal favour, More replied, 'Son Roper, I may tell thee I have no cause to be proud thereof, for, if my head could win him a castle in France, it should not fail to go.'

Deepening Shadows.—It was not long before Sir Thomas More's fears were realized. King Henry was bent on securing, at all costs, a divorce from Katherine of Aragon and marrying Anne Boleyn, and, in order to effect this, began to subordinate in the most arrogant fashion all other aims to this purely personal matter. An Act of Succession was passed, and all officials were required to take an oath acknowledging the King's claim to authority in spiritual questions. When More accepted the Great Seal, he had made it clear to the King, as he thought, that he could not serve him in the matter of the divorce, but in spite of that it was simply incredible to Henry that More should honestly

consider his actions wrong. But he tried his Chancellor's patience too severely. The result was that, on 16th May 1532, More resigned his office. This brought serious financial loss, but he met it with a merry heart. Meanwhile, in defiance of Papal authority, Anne Boleyn was secretly married to King Henry, but More refused to go to the Coronation. The Act of Succession (1534) had decreed that all the King's subjects should swear before Royal Commissioners that they would observe and maintain the Act. Penalties of refusal were those of misprision of treason. On 12th April 1534, More was cited to appear before the Commissioners at the Archbishop's Palace at Lambeth for the purpose of taking the new oath. He refused, but would give no reason for this except that in his conscience the truth seemed on the other side. In the late autumn of 1534 a new Act was passed. There was conferred on the King the title of Supreme Head of the Church in place of the Pope. The new Act decreed that to deny maliciously any of the royal titles was tantamount to high treason. When More was asked his opinion of this new statute, he declined further answer, though he knew that death had been made the penalty for those who refused to accept the King's supremacy.

In the Tower.—His friends tried to persuade him to yield; others threatened. The upshot was that he was accused of high treason and confined in the Tower. The governors and officials there did their best to make his life as easy as possible. It was Margaret Roper, his daughter, who was his chief comforter. It was to her that his last letter was written, with the aid of charcoal, for his pen had been taken away from him. 'Farewell, my dear child,' he wrote to her on the day before he died, 'and pray for me and I shall for you and your friends that we may merrily meet in heaven.' Few stories are more touching than those which describe her affectionate loyalty to her father and her parting embraces, as he was led back for the last time to the Tower. It was then that More's beauty of character shone forth. During his fifteen months' imprisonment he wrote some of his finest devotional manuals—possibly the most spiritual being *Dialogue of Comfort in Tribulation*. Broken in health but indomitable in soul, he wrote: 'And this may be comfort to all good men in their night's fear, in their dark tribulation, that though they fall into the claws or the teeth of those lion's whelps, yet shall all that they can do not pass beyond the

body, which is but as the garment of the soul. For the soul itself, which is the substance of the man, is so surely fenced in round about with the shield of the peace of God. . . . ' He was tried on 1st July 1535, condemned, and on the 6th July was executed.

His Execution.—When he arrived at the scaffold, it was found to be so weak that it was ready to fall, and he said merrily to Sir Edmund Walsingham, 'I pray you, Master Lieutenant, see me safe up, and for my coming down, let me shift for myself.' On the scaffold he was heard to say, 'I call you to witness, brothers, that I die in and for the faith of the Catholic Church, the King's loyal servant, but God's first.'

Thus died Sir Thomas More. He was indeed a martyr in this sense, at least, that he was a noble witness to the supremacy of conscience over the life. Rather than surrender for fear of death what he again and again admitted to be but an opinion, he blithely laid down his life.

His Character and Place in Literature.—We seem to know him better than most of the great Englishmen of his age. His whimsical humour and the naturalness of his ineffable charm attract us still. His unaffected simplicity of heart, his humility in the hour of elevation, above all, his tender solicitude for the poor and the oppressed, make him stand out above his peers as 'a very perfect gentil knight.' But he is remarkable also for the width and liberality of his culture. He was the first Englishman with a European outlook on affairs. His travels abroad and his study of the politics of his day, coupled with unusually close and piercing powers of observation, enabled him to take a detached and comparative view of the political situation abroad. In English literature we think of him as our first great modern, for, while he points back to medievalism, to William Langland, for example, the friend of the peasant, he points forward to Edmund Burke, the adviser on foreign problems. By his life of Richard III. he can be acclaimed as the first great English vernacular historian.

Yet, great as he was as scholar, humanist, and philosopher, he was greatest as a saint and as a student of the interior life. Few men have had more gifts for inspiring love. Of a truth, the deepest cause of his fame was his sheer goodness. The homely mirth, the untroubled serenity of his life, the peace that seems to brood over it make it almost easy for us to forget the troublous scenes in which it was spent.

A Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron in Greek.

BY PROFESSOR DR. D. PLOOIJ, DEN DOLDER, UTRECHT, HOLLAND.

RECENTLY New Testament research has been favoured by what seems an uninterrupted stream of new discoveries of very ancient textual material. The Chester Beatty Papyri, admirably edited by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, proved part of a codex, another part of which, containing large portions of the Pauline Epistles, came into the possession of Michigan University, and was published a few weeks ago by Professor Henry A. Sanders. Meanwhile Mr. Idris H. Bell and Mr. T. C. Skeat had published papyrus fragments of 'an Unknown Gospel,' the oldest written document of early Christianity, dating about A.D. 150. The most surprising find, however, in some ways perhaps the most important too, was the discovery of a portion of a Diatessaron in Greek. This time it was, curiously enough, not the soil of Egypt which returned its long-hidden treasures, but the desert sand of a buried city in Mesopotamia. Hitherto not a line of a Greek Diatessaron was known, though it had been taken for granted by most scholars that Tatian wrote his Harmony in Greek. So the find was in itself quite a surprise, and that it turned up, not in a Greek but in a Syriac region, made it more romantic than ever. No Father, it is true, had ever said that the Diatessaron was Greek, nor does any Father quote a line of it in Greek. But its name seemed to justify the axiomatic assumption that it was Greek, and Tatian's only extant work was written in good Hellenistic Greek. The name 'Diatessaron,' it is true, was not invented by Tatian: it had been given, according to Eusebius in his letter to Carpianus, by Ammonius the Alexandrian to his synoptic arrangement of the Gospels. But who this Ammonius was and when he lived Eusebius does not tell us. It is, however, clear that a Synopsis precedes a Harmony: a Harmony cannot be composed without a Synopsis having been made first. It is only probable that Ammonius, or somebody else, had arranged the Gospels in synoptical parallels, taking (as Ammonius did) the Gospel of Matthew as the leading Gospel before Tatian composed his Harmony, where equally Matthew is the leading Gospel, and that the name of this Synopsis 'Diatessaron' was given also to its successor, the Harmony. However, all this is merely speculation; as to the original language of the text of the Diatessaron, no proof was as yet forthcoming. This fragment, tiny though it be,

may perhaps serve to solve finally a problem which for lack of material has been hitherto insoluble.

The fragment is one out of a series of startling discoveries made by the excavations of Yale University in co-operation with the French Academy in Dura-Europos on the Euphrates. The city was an outpost of the Roman Empire against its Eastern enemies, and a Roman garrison defended it during the first half of the third century, but was at last, in A.D. 256-257, finally destroyed by Shapur I. In the defence of the city the Roman garrison had constructed a great embankment of earth, ashes, and rubbish along the inner face of the western city wall, and for this purpose the houses built on the inner side of this wall were partly destroyed, and the remaining part covered with a glaciis which, after the destruction of the whole city, was buried in the desert sand. It was in this place that important remains of a private house were found, partly turned into a Christian chapel, the walls of which were adorned with the oldest Christian paintings hitherto found in the East. The church dates, as appears from a graffito found in the site, from A.D. 222. In 1933 at some distance from this Christian *domus ecclesiae* was discovered a complex of buildings, the main part of which proved to be a Jewish synagogue. It was built in A.D. 244-245, as appears from an Aramaic inscription, and was equally destroyed in A.D. 256.

It was under the same glaciis which covered the Christian church and the Jewish synagogue that on March 5th, 1933, there was found the parchment fragment now known as Dura Parchment 24, Yale University. [Mrs. Susan Hopkins was the first to recognize it as a portion of the Gospel.] The parchment was entrusted to the capable hands of Professor Carl H. Kraeling of Yale, to whom we are now indebted for its *editio princeps*. He published it as Number III. of *Studies and Documents*, edited by Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake (London: Christophers, 1935). The edition contains, besides a very clear facsimile of the fragment, a diplomatic transcript and a restored text with textual apparatus. An elaborate discussion of the find itself and of the problems raised and solved by it opens the general exchange of studies and results which beyond any doubt the new text will elicit, and we can only congratulate Professor Kraeling on this promising inauguration of these studies.

The fragment consists of a small piece of fairly heavy parchment, measuring c. 9.5 × 10.5 cm., probably belonging, not to a codex, but to a roll, being written on one side only. Fifteen lines of script are visible, fourteen of which can be read and restored with a fair degree of assurance. On palaeographical grounds (though palaeographical doctors usually disagree!) it may safely be assigned to the first half of the third century, and this date is amply confirmed, and may even be confined within narrower limits, by archaeological considerations. *Terminus ante quem* is the final destruction of Dura in A.D. 256, the fragment having been found under the Roman glacis made for the defence of the city and since untouched. The Christian chapel belonged to a private house which either itself was built between A.D. 222 and 235, or the rooms of which were prepared for use as a chapel in that period. We may safely assume that the fragment, found at a distance of about 150 metres from the chapel, was connected with the services in that church.

The find, though providing us with only a few short lines, is certainly of primary importance, and it is disappointing to learn from Dr. Kraeling in a private letter to me, that no hope can be entertained of finding further parts of the text in the area where it was discovered. Its importance is, of course, not in fresh information about the Gospel story, but in its bearing upon the textual evolution of the Gospel text, and especially on the problem of the earliest history of Tatian's Harmony which has been transmitted to us only in fragmentary condition with regard to the Syriac text and in translated forms, none of which can claim full identity with the original.

Dr. Kraeling has, on the whole, successfully and reliably, restored the text of the fragment. Here follows its contents to which I only add in small letters the initials of the Gospels from which its constituent parts have been taken:

[Ζεβεδ]αιου^{Mt} και Σαλωμη^{Mk} κ[α]ι αι γυναικες^{Mt Mk Lk}
 [των συ]νακολουθησαντων^{Lk Mt Mk} α[ντ]ω^{Mk Lk} απο της
 [Γαλιλαι]ας^{Mt Lk} ορωσαι^{Lk} τον σ[τα]ν^α ην δε
 [η ημερ]α παρασκευη^{Lk} σαββατον επεφω
 [σκεν^{Lk} ο]ψιας δε γενομενης^{Mt Mk} επι τ[η] π[α]ρ[α]σ
 [κευη^{Mk} ο] εστιν προσαββατον^{Mk} προσ
 [ηλθεν]^{Mk} ανθρωπος^{Mt} βουλευτη[ς]^{Mk Lk} υ[παρ]
 [χων^{Lk} α]πο ερινμαθαια[ς]^{Mt Mk Lk Jn} π[ο]λεως της
 [Ιουδα]ιας^{Lk} ονομα^{Mt Lk} Ιω[σηφ]^{Mt Mk Lk Jn} α[γ]αθος
 [καιος^{Lk}] ων μαθητης [το]ν ε[ν] κα[τα]κε^{[Lk δι}
 [κρυμ]μενος δε δια τον φοβον των

[Ιουδαιω]ν^{Jn} και αυτος^{Mt Mk} προσεδεχετο^{Lk Mk}
 [την] β[ασιλειαν] του θ[υ]^{Mk Lk} ουτος ουκ
 [ην συνκατα]τιθεμεν[ος] της β[ουλη]^{Lk}

There is no reasonable doubt that the fragment is really Tatian. A glance at Dr. Kraeling's very convenient conspectus of the parallel texts of the Arabic, the Fuldensis, and the L^{med} (the mediæval Dutch text of the Liège MS.) texts shows at once so close an affinity both in method and structure of harmonization, that notwithstanding differences in detail, the essential agreement is apparent. The most conspicuous difference is that the Latin tradition agrees with Ephrem (p. 259 of Moesinger's edition) in inserting Jn 19³¹⁻³⁹ after the passage on the women standing at a distance from the Cross, as against the combined testimony of Dura and the Arabic. That Ephrem stands on the side of the Latins shows that this is not a peculiarity of the Western version, but is part of the early Syriac tradition also. I cannot speak as confidently as Dr. Kraeling does about the priority of Dura and the Arabic in this case, but would leave this question open for the present. I only wish to emphasize the fact, exemplified in this case, but also in innumerable others, that the textual variation, both in minor and in more important points, is far greater in a Harmony than in any of the Canonical Gospels. It had, being a composition of a secondary author, no direct apostolical sanction, and was open to anybody who wished to alter its order of harmonization or even its text, especially in the earlier stages of its evolution. Moreover, in the original Tatianic Harmony, though a masterpiece of faithful reproduction of all the matter contained in the Canonical Gospels, there was also embodied a good deal of extra-canonical matter and literary paraphrase, which has gradually been removed in the later forms. Even between Aphrahat and Ephrem there are textual variations.

In this connexion I would draw attention to a remarkable reading in the Dura fragment. Instead of ορωσαι ταυτα of the Greek Lukan text it reads ι³ ορωσαι τον σ[τα]ν (= στανρωθέντα). The abbreviation is very archaic, being extant, as far as I know, only in two instances in P⁴⁶, the papyrus of the Pauline Epistles recently edited by Professor Sanders. In this papyrus (middle of the third century) the ρ is generally retained, but omitted in two places: ε[σταν] for ε[σται]ρωσαν and σ[του] for στανρωδ. The Dura reading itself, however, is remarkable because it gives a striking close to the Crucifixion story instead of the colourless ταυτα. The expression is found also in the Gospel of Peter,

where in ch. 13⁵⁶ the angel at the tomb asks : ' What have ye come for ? whom seek ye ? not that crucified One (τὸν σταυρωθέντα) ? ' The parallel is noteworthy because we know that at least two features of the Gospel of Peter had been embodied in the Old-Syriac Diatessaron : that of Pet 7²⁵ the saying : *Woe to our sins, the judgment and the end of Jerusalem is drawn nigh*, extant with little variation in Ephrem, pp. 245, 248, and added to Lk 23⁴⁸ in the Old-Syriac Gospel texts and in the Old-Latin (!) codex g¹, and the reading *he departed to Him that sent him*, in Pet 13²⁵ and in the Doctrine of Addai. These parallels are important for two reasons. First, because they confirm the fact just mentioned that Tatian, though faithfully using in his Harmony the material of the Canonical Gospels, has freely incorporated in his composition matter and forms borrowed from other sources. And, secondly, for the fact that we find no trace of these ' apocryphal ' variants in the Greek, but only in the Old-Latin and in the Syriac tradition of the Gospel text, a fact to which we shall come back presently.

For these reasons a Harmony could, in the long run, never compete with the Canonical Gospels. It could as such never take their place in any Church, the only exception being, as far as we know, the Syriac Church where it retained its position as ' the Gospel ' for nearly two centuries. Then, however, it was excommunicated and persecuted as heretical. Wherever a Harmony appears on the scene, it comes as a convenient vehicle for the teaching of the gospel to simple folk. As such it was introduced into Syria by its great Apostle Tatian, and it was due only to this origin of the Syriac Church, as well as to its more or less isolated position, independent from the Greek-speaking Church, that it kept its place so long. It had won Syria for Christianity, and the fact that in the fifth century, a long while after the Peshitta had been introduced, Theodoret found more than two hundred copies in use, both in orthodox and unorthodox parishes of his diocese, shows the tenacity of the devotion it had won among simple believers.

In the West it never came as far as that. The researches of Professor Vogels of Bonn and others in the Old-Latin texts of the Gospels have revealed the fact that at the basis of the whole Latin textual tradition of the Gospels is an Old-Latin version of the Diatessaron, which has left its mark upon all the subsequent Latin translations of the Gospels. There is only one exception : it is just possible that the Old-Latin Marcionite text of Luke is a little older than the Old-Latin Diatessaron ; at any rate

it equally left its traces in the Latin tradition, though much less frequent. In the West, however, the Diatessaron was very early displaced by the separate Gospels, and even the memory of a Latin Diatessaron had died out when Victor of Capua in the sixth century discovered a text of the Latin Harmony already thoroughly corrected or corrected by him to the Vulgate. And when from the twelfth to the fourteenth century a revival occurs of preaching the gospel to simple and ignorant folk, the Harmony again comes on the scene, but never reached the level of an official Gospel liturgically used in the Church.

All this explains fully two facts : first, that from the beginning the textual tradition of the Diatessaron was so much less constant than that of the Gospels, and, secondly, why no Greek text had as yet been forthcoming. The separate Gospels were in Greek from the beginning, and that they should have been anywhere replaced by a Harmony in the Church is excluded.

It has already been stated that none of the Greek Fathers quotes a line from Tatian's Diatessaron. Eusebius, whose testimony is first and most important among the Greek Fathers, mentions the Diatessaron in a rather vague way. ' Tatian, ' he says, ' composed a kind of interweaving and combination (συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν) of the Gospels, I know not how (οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως), and called it Diatessaron. Among some it is still in use. ' A writer like Eusebius, who has preserved for us innumerable quotations from Greek sources now entirely lost, could scarcely speak in such vague terms about the Diatessaron if he had seen it in Greek.

But there is another difficulty. Hermann von Soden, in his monumental work on the text of the New Testament which (along with a good many mistakes unavoidable in human work of such dimensions and undertaken with partly unqualified assistance) contains a huge mass of evidence, has observed that in the tradition of the Gospels the most disturbing factors are the parallel and harmonistic influences.

The way in which von Soden has presented his indigestible mass of material has to a great extent impaired the use of his work, but this thesis of his should have attracted closer attention than (with the exception of Vogels and very few others) it has hitherto found. Von Soden, it is true, bases his thesis upon the textual evidence of the Arabic Diatessaron, which has suffered severely from correction to the Peshitta. But this mistake only strengthens von Soden's position. If such a

corrected form of the Diatessaron already proves—as seems undeniable—von Soden's thesis, how much more so if—as has since been done—the Latin also, and, as far as available, the Syriac is taken into consideration? But where do we really find this influence? In the Old-Syriac and the Old-Latin certainly, but also in some Greek MSS—for instance, Codex Bezae and even in some very late cursives. Is this influence in Greek MSS explained unless we assume the existence of an early Greek text of the Diatessaron?

Does the Dura fragment give here the solution?

We first remark that the textual influence of the Diatessaron is not confined to, but is manifest especially in what we call the 'Western' texts. But here in the central MS., Codex Bezae, there is no *direct* influence from a Greek Diatessaron upon the Greek column of Bezae, but a reaction from its Latin side. I do not give—just in passing!—a kind of solution for this greatest of textual puzzles, the Bezan text; I only remark that the Greek of Codex Bezae is not a homogeneous Greek text, nor its Latin column a homogeneous Latin. In the Bezan Greek we can trace a Latin element conflated with a Greek text of a very archaic type. Something similar seems to be the case in the Freer Gospels, in Mark at any rate. But the harmonistic element in Bezae is, as far as I can see, not Greek but Latin. And we must ask whether in all cases of Diatessaron influence in the Separate Gospels this is a reaction from a Version, or *direct* dependence upon an original Greek text, now lost but for the Dura fragment. Is the Dura fragment witness to an original Greek text or is it a translation from the Syriac?

Dr. Kraeling thinks the former, and says (p. 18) that 'with the Dura fragment in hand, it seems hard to escape the conclusion that Greek was actually the language of the original Harmony.'

In this preliminary statement of the problems raised by the Dura fragment, I cannot enter into a detailed discussion which necessarily must be very technical. But a few remarks may serve to put the question clearly.

The fragment has been found in Dura Europos, on the highroad between Babylonia on the south, and Palmyra and Edessa on the north. About A.D. 200 a Christian Church was already firmly established at Edessa and was Syriac. We cannot go far astray if we suppose that Dura had received its Gospel from there. In the city where the Romans had a garrison and which was important as a military and commercial centre, there lived, along with the native Syrians, a very mixed popula-

tion of Parthians, Greeks, and Romans, the common means of intercourse between these various nationalities being, of course, as everywhere in the Roman Empire, Greek. Numerous inscriptions, most of them Greek, even when the proper names are merely transcriptions of Aramaic, bear witness to this fact. Dr. Kraeling concludes that both for Dura and for the cities of Mesopotamia generally, a Greek Diatessaron was a practical means for spreading Christianity in the Mesopotamian Lowlands. I doubt, however, whether this conclusion is right. Greek inscriptions abound everywhere, and are far more numerous than those written in Semitic or any other native language. But this fact does not prove at all that the native population generally would speak Greek, even if this language was understood by many. I would only refer to the convincing pages which Zahn (*Forsch.* i. 39-44) has devoted to this question of the relation of Greek and Syriac. A Gospel for the *native* population should, to my view, be certainly Syriac, and was actually so in Edessa. The native population was, of course, analphabete, and the preponderance of Greek graffiti should not mislead us.

All this, however, is merely speculative: we may, however, find, in so far as such a tiny portion of the Diatessaron text can afford sufficient material, some surer answer to the question (1) in the textual relations, and (2) in the linguistic character of the Dura text.

The textual relations point, in my opinion, decidedly in a definite direction, though not in that where Dr. Kraeling seeks the solution. To begin with, we should be perfectly clear about the consequences of either theory, that of an original Greek and that of translated Greek. The Dura text dates from c. A.D. 200. Accordingly in the first case, that of an original Greek, we should find a Greek text made up from a textual form of the Gospels preceding the great Uncials and the Versions, i.e. it should be free from secondary readings not extant in the Greek but only in the earliest Versions. In the latter case, that of translated Greek, we should find connexions with a very early type of Greek text, like that underlying the Versions, and with the text of the early Syro-Latin Diatessaron tradition.

In the Dura fragment we find as a matter of fact textual connexions with a very archaic text form. For instance, when in l. 1 it reads, with the Vatican MS. and the Sahidic only, αἱ γυναῖκες, and in l. 9 ἀγαθὸς δίκαιος equally with B and Sah. only, this means, whatever our further researches may reveal, that either Tatian or his translator used a very

⁴ For further particulars cf. the *Bezan Bulletin*, iii, 14-17, and iv, 16-19.

but still the suggestion remained merely hypothetical. But the reading is not unique!

Codex Colbertinus (*c*) which is based on a very archaic Old-Latin text, and shows clear traces of being influenced by the Old-Latin Diatessaron, reads Lk 23⁴⁹ in this form: 'stabant autem omnes noti eius de longinquo et mulieres eorum quae secutae erant illum a Galilaea videntes illa.'

This is the reading of the Dura text in which, however, a corrector of *c* has introduced a correction from the Vulgate. He changed the 'wrong' masculine into the 'correct' feminine, but overlooked the added *eorum*, which now treacherously testifies to the underlying Diatessaron text. If the Old-Latin Diatessaron contained the reading, this means that it has taken it from a Syriac text, and the suggested solution of the Dura text is no more purely hypothetical. Has the Syriac taken it from a Greek original?

Let us face the chronological consequences: Tatian composed his Harmony *c.* A.D. 173. The Old-Latin Gospels existed already in A.D. 200. The Old-Latin Diatessaron can scarcely be later than A.D. 180 and practically contemporary with the Syriac. Is it conceivable that in less than seven years (1) the Greek Diatessaron was composed; (2) suffered that curious corruption in a single copy (for Kraeling does not suppose that the variant is due to Tatian himself, which is really very improbable; (3) this copy was perpetuated and its variant taken over in a Syriac translation; and (4) this Syriac reached Latin regions and was there done into Latin. It would seem to me that this reconstruction of the history of the variant is

exceedingly improbable. Is it not much simpler to regard the variant as a very obvious Syriac idiomatism, which found its way to the contemporary Latin on one side and to a contemporary Greek on the other?

It would seem to me that the Dura fragment, instead of being a conclusive witness to an original Greek, rather testifies to the original Syriac of Edessa. From there Dura received its Gospel, which for the use of a minority of foreign visitors of the Chapel had been turned into Greek. Both in Syria and in Latin regions the mistake of the Syriac Diatessaron text has been observed: the later Syriac translations clearly wish to evade it by changing the participle of the previous Diatessaron text into a perfect tense; the Vulgate reviser of Codex *c* alters the masculine into the feminine.

Is it accidental that it is just a portion of the Passion story which has been preserved? This was the part which played the most important rôle in the services of the Church. Some MSS of the Harclensis contain a Harmony of the Passion, not identical with Tatian's Harmony, but still a Harmony. And Augustine says that in Latin Churches also this part of the Gospels was read harmonistically or in parallels.¹ So, if for any part of a Gospel Harmony a translation should be made, it would be very likely that part of the gospel story of which a fragment has now been found in Dura.

¹ Readers of *Temple Gairdner of Cairo* may recall how he composed a Harmony of the Passion Story in Arabic for use in his church at Boulac on Good Friday morning.

Contributions and Comments.

'Ye are the salt of the earth' (Matt. v. 13).

An interesting reference to this verse appears in a recent issue of *Die Naturwissenschaften*, a German scientific periodical, corresponding to the English *Nature*. In an article by Dr. E. H. Riesenfeld, a Professor of Chemistry, it is pointed out that it was the custom in Palestine, and is even to this day in Arabia, to cover the hearths of baking ovens with plates of salt, which require renewing about every fifteen years. These plates of salt accelerate the combustion of the fuel, and aid considerably the production of a good red fire. It is a scientific

fact that the chlorides of sodium, potassium, magnesium, and calcium act as catalysts in the combustion of carbonaceous materials, and it is just this set of compounds which is found in the salt obtained from the shores of the Dead Sea.

In the East the principal fuel is wood, but this is supplemented by the dried dung of asses and camels. It is difficult to make a good fire of these materials, but if salt is present the fire rapidly 'gets up.' The advantage of using a plate of salt on the hearth is therefore clear.

Dr. Riesenfeld continues by stating that owing to the heat numerous crevices will form in the surface of the plate in time, and that these will

become filled with ash from the fire. The plates could only be cleaned with some difficulty, and, indeed, the easiest course would be to replace them with new ones. The reason why the old plates have to be discarded is because the ash of dried dung contains a fair proportion of the salt sodium phosphate, which acts in just the reverse direction from common salt itself. It tends to stop combustion instead of aiding it. In the light of this, it is useful to read how St. Matthew continues the text: 'If the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.' St. Luke says, 'Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned? It is neither fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill; but men cast it out.' If the explanation given above concerning the use of the salt is accepted, it is seen that the salt no longer of use for the oven will contain phosphates. Now every one knows that phosphates are useful as fertilizers, but the quantity present in the disused salt would not be sufficient to be of service in this connexion. Perhaps this is why Luke says, 'It is neither fit for the land . . .'. It would also be useless on a heap of refuse which had been set aside to decay to make manure, for salt is a preserving agent, and would tend to stop the decay. Hence the phrase 'nor yet for the dunghill.'

Possibly the best translation of the words *ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄλτι μωρανθῆναι* is that of Luther, who renders them as 'wo nun das Salz dumm wird' (when the salt becomes inactive, or dull). This is certainly much better than the translations given in our Authorized or Revised Versions, or by Moffatt, which all refer to the taste of the salt. If the theory put forward by Dr. Riesenfeld is correct, the salt is not useless because of its lack of taste. It is the best part of a chemical impossibility for salt to lose its taste unless treated with drastic chemical reagents. It certainly would not do so in ordinary use. Hence the great probability of the accuracy of the new theory, where the defect in the salt is due to its inactivity in promoting combustion.

A. J. MEE.

Cheltenham.

The Syro-Phœnician Woman: Another Suggestion.

ONE of the most interesting incidents in the life of Jesus is surely this remarkable miracle of the healing at a distance of the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman. But what is unusual about it

is the apparent unwillingness of Jesus. When in her anguish the woman first approaches Him, He seems to take no notice of her. Still she pleads, but twice He answers in a manner that seems to show entire unwillingness on His part to do anything for her—she is a stranger and no Israelite, and apparently His gracious gifts are not intended for such as her.

It all seems so unlike what we should expect of Jesus, and so it is not surprising that various explanations are offered. The one that is perhaps most familiar is that He desired to 'test her faith.' We recognize that He generally asked for an assurance of faith on the part of those who sought His healing powers. But apart from her foreign extraction, there seems nothing to account for the exceptional severity of the test He applied in her case.

And so another explanation has won favour in recent days—that He was really uncertain whether it could be His Father's will that He should heal the girl. Thus, when He said, 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' He was expressing His true mind. Can this be? When the great prophet of the Exile can speak of giving Israel 'for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth,' can we imagine the 'Friend of publicans and sinners' taking up a less generous position? Again we have the instance, surely earlier in His ministry, of the healing of the Centurion's servant, when He said, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'

It might indeed be argued that He was seeking for another such testimony from one outside the favoured race, to put to shame those who, with their greater spiritual advantages, had not accorded to Him the faith that was so manifestly due to Him. But is there not to hand a better explanation still?

We may surely take it He cannot have been ignorant of the will of His Father. Nor can He have been lacking in sympathy with the cry of human need, which is the same everywhere. Let us remember that His disciples were with Him. Indeed, He had taken this tour through the outlying districts for the purpose of having them alone with Him. He knew their attitude. They were devout Jews, with not a little of Jewish conservatism about them. They were yet to show, by seeking to 'call down fire from heaven,' how little they had learned His spirit where Samaritans were concerned. Can we not imagine what their attitude towards this woman would be?

Indeed, we are told quite plainly. 'Send her away,' they cried; 'for she crieth after us.' But Jesus did not intend to send her away. One has

heard in connexion with the old theory, that He was testing her faith, that the kind look in His eyes all the time gave her encouragement, in spite of His apparently harsh words. This may well have been the case, if it were the *disciples* He was really testing.

Was He not 'holding up a mirror' before them? Was He not saying in effect, 'Do you really wish Me to treat this woman, in severe anguish over her loved one, as a "dog," because her skin and her speech are not quite the same as yours? Have I been so long time with you, and do you not know Me better than that?'

We all know that His was an international gospel—we Gentiles (*pace* the British-Israelites), strangers to the covenant of Israel, have profited by it. Surely this was so from the very day He accepted His Messianic work; it was His purpose, by practice as well as by precept, to teach His disciples so. Thus often have we to learn our more difficult lessons by methods which have in them the essence of pain; we need to be shown how unlovable we are apt to prove ourselves, that we may be led to seek His grace to become what He would have us be. P. DOUGLAS HAMILTON.

Amphill.

Entre Nous.

Bishop Welldon and Present-Day Topics.

Forty Years On (Nicholson & Watson; 15s. net) is not a volume of reminiscences, for Bishop Welldon has already written his reminiscences. It is the Bishop in his own wise, kindly, tolerant, and far-seeing way talking to an interested audience on those subjects and events which have impressed him most and, as he says himself, 'shedding a certain light upon them by the experiences which I have enjoyed both at home and abroad.' No one reading the book can fail to be struck by the many points at which he touches life, and it is not surprising when we remember that he has been successively Headmaster of Dulwich, Headmaster of Harrow, Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan in India, Canon of Westminster, Dean of Manchester, and Dean of Durham.

There is a good deal of humour in the volume. One story which Bishop Welldon tells is of an archdeacon who 'was giving an account of St. Paul's missionary journeys, but the reporter imagined that he was giving an account of his own. The consequence was, that when the report of the sermon appeared in a local newspaper the next morning the archdeacon was made to relate how he had been exposed to grave annoyance in the course of his ministry; he had once been physically maltreated at Derby, and had been almost stoned to death at Leicester. It may well be believed that the archdeacon received hearty congratulations on his twofold providential escape.'

There are few of the pressing topics of to-day that are not discussed by Bishop Welldon. Take, for instance, the drink trade, mixed marriages, and exclusiveness.

The Drink Trade.—'It is not the drink, but the drink trade which may so easily become the enemy of human welfare and of human virtue. Few people, if they were left to themselves, would drink more than is good for them. But when the vendors of alcoholic drinks are permitted, and even encouraged, to use a great variety of means of attracting men and women to begin, and to continue, the practice of drinking, then the evil of inebriety ensues. When it begins, it is not easily suppressed. Great, then, is the responsibility which lies upon parents, not only by precept, but by practice, to deliver their children from the temptation to strong drink. A man or a woman who has never tasted strong drink never needs to taste it.' Earlier he tells an amusing story of 'the ingenuity of a vendor of strong drinks in Tib Lane at Manchester, who, feeling himself annoyed by my championship of the temperance cause, added to a long list of alcoholic drinks outside his shop a line, in which he advertised a new drink called "The Dean." There is, I think, an old-established drink known as "Bishop," but the "Dean" was a novelty. I could only hope that the drink, so-named after my office, if not after myself, would prove to be a nauseous beverage.'

Mixed Marriages.—'No sincere Christian could conscientiously approve a marriage between a Christian and a non-Christian. But where no absolute division of religious faith or social usage exists, as between two Christians, one European and the other Oriental, one white and the other coloured, I cannot see that such a marriage is in itself necessarily reprehensible. For Christians are all one in Christ Jesus; and if that unity does not

reach the point of sanctioning the most intimate of all relations, it must be held to lose a great part of its value.'

Exclusiveness.—'It was my privilege in Calcutta to know a native Christian gentleman who had been converted to Christianity some thirty years before I met him. He lived in one street of Calcutta, and his mother in an adjoining street; but, from the day of his conversion until the day when I met him last, there was not a letter which he had written to his mother but it had been sent back to him unopened. What is a man who has made so great a sacrifice for Christ to say or think, if he is told that, because he was baptized by a Presbyterian minister and is himself nominally a Presbyterian, he cannot worship freely in a church of the Church of England? He is not only pained but shocked at such spiritual exclusiveness; he feels that the unity of Islam is greater than the unity of Christianity; he despairs of seeing the Church of Christ, divided as it is, ever spread itself over the heathen or non-Christian world.'

Conciliation.

'It had long been my wish, although I had scarcely hoped I should be able, to see the famous statue known as the Christus of the Andes. In the early part of 1924 I went out to Chile; and, as I was coming home from Buenos Aires, I thought that, in crossing the country from Valparaiso to Buenos Aires, I would stay at Puente del Inca, a village containing a hotel from which the ascent of the Andes is usually made. . . . The statue commemorates the termination of the long dispute as to the boundary line between Chile and Argentina. There had been a series of wars over the boundary line between Chile and Argentina, as there has been since over the boundary line between Chile and Peru. At last the two republics agreed by a convention, which was signed on April 17, 1896, that they would refer their dispute to the arbitration of Queen Victoria. Queen Victoria died before the tribunal, which had been appointed to advise her, could publish its report. The award was therefore pronounced by King Edward VII. on November 25th, 1902. It was unreservedly accepted. . . . It was in memory of King Edward's arbitration, and of its acceptance by the two republics, that the statue of Christ was erected. The statue stands at a height of 12,576 feet above the sea-level—a solitary object with the eternal snows of the Andes rising as a background behind it. It is a figure of Christ lifting His right hand in benediction, and in His left hand holding a cross. . . . Nobody, I think,

who has visited the Christus of the Andes can help cherishing the memory of the fact that the republics of Argentina and Chile should have pledged themselves in the name of Christ the Redeemer to accept the arbitration as putting an end to their long-standing disputes. Even to-day, when the train running over the Andes reaches its highest point, the Chileans and the Argentines, who are passengers by it, stand up in their carriages and shake hands.'¹

Women and the Ministry.

'Apart from the established usage of the Church, I cannot see,' says Bishop Welldon (*Forty Years On*, p. 213), 'that there can be any ultimate objection to the ordination of women. Women have always been the more religious of the two sexes; they have made valuable contributions to religious literature—perhaps, above all, to hymnology. It is evident that a woman is better qualified than a man could be to offer counsel to women upon many points affecting womanhood. Women are already beginning to be ordained in some of the more liberal Churches outside the Church of England, and I can feel little doubt that they will be, soon or late, ordained within the Church. There are women whose whole nature qualifies them for a spiritual ministry. They will be able to render service in some respects better than men can render it.'

This subject is also dealt with this month by Edith Anne Robertson in a little booklet *Why those Fears?* (Duncan Bell; 2d.). One of the fears, she says, which prevents the removal of the sex barrier is just this tradition—the established usage of the Church that Bishop Welldon speaks about. In answering the objection she quotes Dr. Gore's striking words on tradition in the 'Church Times' of January 2nd, 1920: 'Our Lord cursed tradition. "Thus and thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect through your tradition." He wanted open-minded people, ready for a new venture. . . . But the men of tradition only wanted to maintain the traditions . . . and our Lord unclothed them and unmasked them. And He asked for open-minded people, who would be ready to see the new light; and He found them few, but real. And those He found were the only people that mattered. Those Pharisees and Sadducees, those people who clung to the thing that was—they have passed. And those who made the future were the men and women of open mind, those who followed Jesus, who welcomed the new thing.'

The other four fears which keep the ministry

¹ Bishop Welldon, *Forty Years On*, 95.

closed to women are that our Lord would not approve; that St. Paul would be grieved to see an equal fellowship in the Church to-day; that the move on behalf of the ministry of women is an effort made from without—political or feminist; and last, that the family would suffer if equal rights were granted. Mrs. Robertson's little pamphlet may be commended for the use both of those who are opposed, and for those who wish to find arguments for the cause which they espouse.

Franciscan 'Noughting.'

Studies which he originally worked out for an international class have now been published by Mr. J. S. Hoyland of the Woodbrooke Settlement at Selly Oak with the title *The Way of St. Francis and To-day* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). The title shows the plan of the book, for the first half of it is an account of St. Francis, and the second half deals with the modern Franciscan Movement as Mr. Hoyland sees it spreading to-day. He believes that there will be the First, Second, and Third Orders to-day as in the days of St. Francis. 'There will be a fellowship of men who are prepared to go the whole way with Francis and with Christ. There will also be a fellowship of women, prepared to do the same. . . . Then there will be a far larger Third fellowship, of men *and* women, often married people, resolved to cut their expenditure to the minimum, in order to help the world's need, and to live the Franciscan life of manual service for the poor.

'These three fellowships will, I believe, act in the new future—act decisively—both in the industrial sphere and in the international sphere, for Christ and for reconciliation. They will torpedo both capitalism and socialism (because both retain the "proprium"—"the instinct to grab things for oneself from the Universe and retain them at all costs"): they will torpedo both nationalism and the Third International (because both retain force). They will bring a new spirit of peace into the class-problem by self-identification with the dispossessed: and into the international problem by humble service done for the needy, through manual labour, across national barriers—such service as was done by the War Victims' Relief during the War and after, such service as is being done by the Service Civil International in the earthquake-stricken districts of Northern India to-day.'

Mr. Hoyland knows from his own experience that the Franciscan way works—the abandonment of the attitude that 'this is mine,' helping poorest by manual labour, 'noughting'—realizing that we

ourselves count for nothing at all. As George Fox once said, 'We are nothing, Christ is all.' Mr. Hoyland gives his own experience: 'My ordinary work of education, I am now convinced, was far less valuable than the feeble efforts put forth to help the sick, for example, in the influenza epidemic in 1918 or in the famine of 1921. These were times of excessively hard work, but of intensely joyful fellowship with Christ through action. In our own land, except under exceptional circumstances, the neediest are fortunately not the sick, but the workless. And many of us can say that it is as we share their lives—as we "consort with them" in the Franciscan phrase—not in the spirit of that which is called "social service," and which a distinguished German writer has aptly called "the Red Cross behind the capitalist firing-line," but in order to work beside them on their allotments and share their homes; it is as we do this that we learn the true gaiety, friendliness and beauty of Christ-fellowship.'

I Corinthians xiii.

'Gifts and graces which God intended to be the adornment of the Christian community may cease to be its adornment, and become its snare. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels"—that is religion as ecstatic emotionalism. "Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge"—that is religion as *gnosis*, intellectualism, speculation. "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor"—that is religion as working energy. "Though I give my body to be burned"—that is religion as asceticism. All these one-sided and patently inadequate representations of the Gospel, Paul expressly repudiates.'¹

Acts xxviii. 3-6.

'When the fire grew hot a long black snake wound slowly out into our group; we must have gathered it, torpid, with the twigs.'²

¹ J. S. Stewart, *A Man in Christ*, i.

² T. E. Lawrence, *Revolt in the Desert*, 107.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.